

1878 4151.d

THE
People called *Quakers*
D E F E N D E D,
AND
The *Baptists* Confuted,
BEING

4151.d. 11

A R E P L Y, to *Job Burt's* pretended Answer to
R. B's 12th Proposition, and to a Book, intituled,
A Vindication of the Doctrine of Baptism, &c.

To which is annex'd,

An A P P E N D I X, in Answer to *Oswald Edwards*
of *Dublin* his Attempt against the said Book, &c.

In which R E P L Y and A P P E N D I X,
Their fallacious Reasoning is detected; their Erro-
neous and confused Notion of Spiritual Baptism
obviated; their repeated Contradictions and
Inconsistencies manifested; and the Doctrine
of Baptism, as held by the People called *Quakers*,
is farther inforced and vindicated.

J O S I A H F O R S T E R.

One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, Eph. iv. 5.

London: Printed and Sold by T. SOWLE RAYLTON
and LUKE HINDE, at the Bible in George-Yard,
Lombard-street, 1740.

[Price One Shilling.]

THE People called Quakers DEFENDED.

The Baptists Contended.

BEING

A Reply to the late published Answer to
A. B. 18th Proposition, and to a Book, entitled,
A Vindication of the People called Baptists, &c.



An Appendix, in which the
of Dyer has attempted against the said Book, &c.

In which R. P. L. Y. and A. P. R. N. B. X.

Their fallacious Reasoning is detected; their Notions and confused Notion of Spiritual Baptism exposed; their reported Contradictions and Inconsistencies manifested; and the Doctrine of Baptism, as held by the People called Quakers, is farther improved and vindicated.

By J. O. S. I. A. H. F. O. R. S. T. E. R.

One Book, one Price, and one Copy, for one.

LONDON: Printed and Sold by J. GOWIE, Stationer, in Pall-mall, at the Sign of the Gunpowder.
1740.

[Price One Shilling.]

THE
PREFACE
 TO THE
READER.

THIS Discourse is rather defensive than offensive; not an Attack upon the Principles or Doctrine of those that dissent from us, but a Vindication of our own, against the Opposition and Abuse of our Adversaries, who are generally the Aggressors in all Debates of this Nature.

Nor is their present Charge upon us in relation to any external Form or Performance of Religion, which we hold as peculiar to our selves, or in Opposition to them, but because of our Disuse of and Non-compliance with their Practice respecting a certain Ceremony, viz. Water-baptism; and for our firm Faith in, and sole Dependance upon, the Grace of God, the Holy Spirit, purchased thro' the Sufferings, Death, and Mediation of our Redeemer, as being all-sufficient, by its internal Operations, to wash away Sin, to purge and sanctify the Heart, without the Addition, Concurrence, or Help, of any Elementary Water, in what Mode soever administred.

To affirm that this Ceremony, or the Application of material Water to the Body, is a Means of conveying the Sanctification of the Holy Spirit to the Soul, is in it self so destitute of Scripture-evidence, so repugnant to Sense and Reason, and contains in it so much of the Nature of a Miracle, that we think our Opponents, upon solid Consideration, will scarce insist on't.

2. *To those who assert, That it ought to be used symbolically, or as a Resemblance of the sanctifying Efficacy of the Holy Ghost in our Hearts; or as the Dippers say, A Representation of Christ's Death, Burial, and Resurrection: We answer,*

1. *To have Recourse to Figures or Shadows, in Presence of the Substance, or Things signified, is acting with far less Consistence and Prudence in Religion, than Men do in human Affairs: What Man being desirous to have an exact and adequate Idea and Knowledge of any Person or Thing, would with-draw his Regard and Attention from the Person, or Thing it self, to inspect and observe the Image or Picture thereof? If we are favour'd with the Enjoyment of the Holy Spirit, we can't make Application to any thing elementary, externally to resemble or shadow forth the Energy and Efficacy of it in our Hearts, without with-drawing the Eye of our Mind and Attention therefrom, the which will interpose a Mist or Vail betwixt God and the Soul, that will exist, till it returns again to its proper Object, whence it deviated.*

2. *With respect to Christ's Death, &c. we say, there are other Mediums of representing or renewing in our Minds a Sense and Understanding of the Death, Burial*

Burial and Resurrection of our Saviour, much more clear and conspicuous than dipping the Body into Water.

1. *The Testimony of the Holy Scriptures.*

2. *The Preaching of the Word.*

3. *The Evidence of the Holy Spirit within us, which Christ himself told his Disciples, should bring all Things to their Remembrance, whatsoever he had said unto them. And it is plain he had often told 'em of his Death, Burial, and Resurrection.*

But what renders Water-baptism more insignificant and ineffectual for such an Intention, is, that no Person can display or make a Representation of any Action or Thing, but according to the pre-conceived Idea or Notion which he has thereof in himself.

Neither the Dippers, or the Persons dipped, can by that Act of corporeal Immersion, excite in themselves or others any Representation or Likeness of Christ's Passion and Resurrection, other than what they had conceiv'd and form'd in their Imaginations before the Performance of that Action: Nor can they produce either Precept or Example from Holy Scripture to warrant them herein. We can't then, upon a due and serious Consideration, such as every Act and Duty in Religion calls for, believe that Water-baptism is in it self of any real Service or Signification for those Intentions and Purposes proposed by our Opponents, but rather the quite contrary.

If they alledge, that tho' the Use and Service of Water-baptism cannot be made to appear, nor that it is an Action of a moral Nature, yet nevertheless we ought to comply therewith as an Institution of Christ.

Were this as clearly proved, as it is by them frequently and positively asserted, there would be sufficient Reason to engage our Assent and Conformity: But as they have always failed in Performance of the former, however liberal in the latter, it is very injudicious and unreasonable in them to expect our Submission or Compliance; since it could not possibly be on the foot of Conviction, where the proper Motives thereof are absent; our Conformity would be no better than Hypocrisy: What is not of Faith is Sin, saith the Apostle.

'Tis more safe and commendable cautiously to forbear, than to presume to practise, what is it self meerly ceremonious, under the Title and Denomination of a positive Command and Institution of Christ, unless they could shew where the same is clearly and expressly enjoin'd.

*Their repeatedly calling it an Ordinance of the Gospel, an Institution of the Son of God, the * Badge of Christianity, Door of Salvation, &c. and accounting us Antichristian or Heretical for not believing them herein, discovers less Prudence and Charity than might be expected from Men professing Godliness.*

It

It would be as consistent with Religious Controversialists to be more sparing in the One, and refrain from the Other, until they are clearer and more convincing in Point of Probation. And,

How far my Antagonists have discharged themselves in this their incumbent Duty, must be left to the Readers Determination upon a serious and impartial Perusal of the following Answers; and if they, or any of their Adherents, should make Reply, it is desir'd they would act fairly, without evading our Arguments, as they have hitherto generally done.

Let them give our Opinions and Assertions in our own Words at length, and clearly demonstrate the Invalidity and Inconsistence of our Reasonings in Support thereof, as we have done respecting theirs.

But if they should still persist in reiterating and urging their already refuted Allegations and Objections, wholly concealing our Answers and Reasonings advanced in Opposition thereunto, passing them over in profound Silence, as if we had offer'd nothing in our Defence, let 'em not think much if for the future we esteem 'em as Persons, who, by such unfair, disingenuous and unmanly Proceedings, have sufficiently merited our Disregard, manifested the Weakness of their Cause, and their own Inability to maintain it.

To rescue the several Texts from the false Glosses and Perversions of my Antagonists, to remove their Objections, to refute their Cavils, and wholly to dissipate that Obscurity wherewith they and other common Opposers have endeavoured to eclipse and veil the clear
Doctrine

Doctrine of the Gospel, as set forth in the Scripture, respecting the true Christian Baptism by the Holy Spirit, and to anticipate all Pretence of Complaint for evading or pretermittin^g any thing that has the least Appearance of Argument in either of their Attempts, has extended this Reply beyond my proposed Brevity; the Inconvenience then, if any, hence arising, is rather imputable to them who led the Way, than to him who was oblig'd to follow.

The Introduction of empty Formality and fruitless Ceremonies into the Christian Religion, which is purely spiritual, is attended with pernicious Consequences: The Minds of its Professors have thereby been eluded and alienated from the Power and Spirit of God in themselves, to a Dependence upon those Things which could not profit; and thereby become too much correspondent to that State of the degenerate Jews, which the Lord thus complain'd of by the Prophet, viz. My People have committed two Evils, they have forsaken Me the Fountain of living Waters, to hew out to themselves Cisterns, broken Cisterns, that can hold no Water. And as in the Jewish, so in the Christian Church, a Defection in Faith, and Departure from the spiritual Strength and living Fountain, that would have given them Victory over Temptations, and preserv'd them in Holiness of Life, was followed by a Depravation of Manners; their Conversations shew'd, and doth shew, their Profession to be in great measure powerless; and their ceremonial Observations, how strictly soever performed, to be ineffectual for the Rectitude of the Mind. And this Malady of Soul, and Vitiosity of Conduct, together with the Improbability of effecting
a Cure

a Cure by those Anti-evangelical and irrational Methods, taken by them who assume to themselves the Title of the Office of the Cure of Souls, and Ambassadors of Man's Reconciliation with God, have given great Advantage to the Enemies of Christianity.

With what Pungency do they satyrize upon their Morals; and how do they banter, and confront with Sense and Reason, their Tenets and Practices in point of Ceremony, vain and lifeless Formality?

There was never more Need for the Professors of Christianity to retire to the living Fountain, to centre to the Eternal Rock Christ in them, the Hope of Glory; here the Deists, those great Pretenders to Reason and moral Fitness, cannot touch us, neither in Faith nor Practice; the Necessaria Credenda, or Essentials of Christianity, are impregnable; the Perfection this holy Principle leads into, both in a moral and religious Capacity, quite transcends their Pretensions.

The Morality laid down by our Saviour, and his Apostles, far exceeds that deliver'd by the Heathen Philosophers: And as we are not inferior to these pretended Followers of the ancient Ethnics, respecting the Endowments of any natural Abilities, or inherent Principle of Reason; and if we by Faith and Obedience obtain Strength from God, the Assistance of the Holy Spirit, (which they too evidently deny and condemn) to exert and direct our rational Faculties in the Discharge of our Duty towards God and Man, we have Probability, and Encouragement sufficient to believe, that the true Followers of Crucified Jesus may soon

soon put them to Silence, by a more strict Observance of the necessary Relation of Things, a closer Adherence to the Laws and Rules of moral Fitness, and in the Practice of all social Virtues and religious Duties, than they even pretend to.

May this Eternal Word, Reader, this Divine Life, and Power Immortal, direct thee in thy Enquiry after Truth, and excite thee to an earnest Prosecution of the substantial and necessary Part of Religion, which only and alone will stand the Test, and abide the Trial,

Is the sincere Desire of

24 MA 59

Coventry 14th of the
1st Month 1738.

Thy Real Friend,

JOSIAH FORSTER.

THE

THE
 People called *Quakers*
 DEFENDED;
 AND
 The *Baptists* Confuted, &c.

JOB BURT, a *Baptist* Preacher, having compos'd a Discourse against the *Pedobaptists*, by way of Dialogue betwixt a Gentleman and a Tradesman, subjoins thereto what he styles "A Supplement, proving that this Ordinance (*Water-baptism*) is to continue to the second Coming of Christ, or to the End of the World; in answer to the Arguments of the People called *Quakers*, particularly what Mr. Barclay and Mr. Forster have offered on that Subject."

This Title sets forth as if he had answer'd every Argument, both of Barclay's and mine; but his Reader will find himself very much mistaken, and impos'd upon; for certainly none has less answer'd the Expectation rais'd by his Title-Page than he. — I know not that he has quoted one Line of Barclay's, and very few of mine, and has miserably evaded the Arguments of both. But to be brief as possible, I shall use no farther Introduction, but begin with his first Assertion, pag. 97. "I shall now attempt, says he, to prove that *Water-baptism* is an Institution of Jesus Christ, and the only Baptism included in his Commission given to his Disciples

“ *Mat. xxviii. 19.* And in order to prove this, I shall
 “ first treat of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost by shew-
 “ ing, first, negatively, what is not that Baptism; Se-
 “ condly, positively what is the Baptism of the Spirit;
 “ which will be a means to lead us into the Knowledge
 “ of the Argument between us and the People called
 “ *Quakers.*

“ This Change, or New-birth, is by a late * Writer
 “ (who, as well as Mr. *Barclay*, and other Opposers
 “ of Water-baptism) esteem’d, nay, urged to be the
 “ Baptism of the Holy Ghost; I shall therefore en-
 “ deavour to prove that they are greatly mistaken
 “ herein, and that Conversion, or Regeneration, is not
 “ the Baptism of the Spirit, for these Reasons follow-
 “ ing.”

Answ. Had *J. B.* succeeded in his Attempt, I freely
 acknowledge, he would have quite surpassed all who have
 hitherto wrote on the Subject; for though many, in
 order to keep up the Spirit and Reputation of their
 Cause, and themselves in countenance as much as possible,
 have both pretended and attempted to prove the Point,
 I have not yet seen it performed; they have all come
 vastly short of their Pretensions: Nor do I, upon a
 serious Perusal of *J. B.*’s Performance, find, that he has
 made any Advancement, or carried it one Step farther
 than where he found it.

“ Is by a late Writer (who, as well as Mr. *Barclay*,
 “ and other Opposers of Water-baptism) esteem’d, &c.”

—The Relative (*who*) here spoils the Sense, it being
 no Subject to any Verb express’d or understood, is
 wholly redundant.——But why did he not cite our
 Words? Are not a Man’s own Expressions the most
 suitable to represent his Meaning? Would it not have
 been much more becoming a Disputant, to have given
Barclay’s Sense and mine in our own Words at length,
 that the Reader might have seen for himself, than only
 to tell him that we hold such and such Things, and
 thereby

* *Forster’s Answer to Bedingfield* p. 84—89. *Barclay’s Apol.* p. 435

thereby deprive us of the Liberty of speaking for our selves? A very disingenuous Practice! Tho' 'tis what he is culpable of throughout his whole Discourse.

I think, it will appear that *R. Barclay*, and I too, rather speak of Conversion and Regeneration as the Effect or Consequence of the Spiritual Baptism, or sanctifying Operation of the Holy Ghost, than make them precisely one and the same Thing; as Cleanness corporally is the Effect of Washing; and Purity in Gold the Effect or Consequence of Refining.

I shall now proceed to examine his Reasons which he has advanced to prove us mistaken.

' *First*, Because this blessed Change, *says he*, or a "Conversion from Sin unto Holiness, was ever necessary even from the Fall; and we have sufficient Testimony from Scripture to evince the Truth thereof."

This being the Scope and Sum of his *first* Reason, there is no need to cite any more thereof to give a true Idea of his Meaning; for the rest of the Paragraph is little else but a Sort of confused Tautology, *viz.* "was ever necessary.—That there was not a Necessity.—Was necessary.—Was as necessary, &c."

But there's a greater Blunder yet——He has intirely omitted the major Part of the Argument; for what he hath said amounts only to this, *viz.* *Regeneration is not the Baptism of the Spirit, because Regeneration was ever necessary from the Fall!* Which indeed concludes nothing.

In order to have prov'd that Regeneration is not, nor doth not imply, the Spiritual Baptism, because the former was necessary from the Fall, he should first have made it plainly and incontestably appear from Scripture, that the latter was not necessary under the former Dispensation:

But this he has not so much as attempted; whether it happened through Forgetfulness or Inability, I shall leave. However, his Deficiency therein renders his Objection wholly insignificant to the Purpose he intended it, and therefore requires no farther Answer.

Pag. 100: " Secondly, If Conversion is the Baptism
 " of the Spirit, and also that Baptism which *Ananias*
 " exhorteth *Paul* to pass under, I cannot see for what
 " Reason *Ananias* should require *Paul* to arise, in order
 " to his being baptized, *Acts* xxii. 16. And now why
 " tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away
 " thy Sins, calling on the Name of the Lord. What Ar-
 " gument can be advanced, to prove the Posture of the
 " Body is necessary to the Conversion of the Soul?
 " But besides this, it is evident that *Paul* was converted
 " before *Ananias* was sent unto him, from what the
 " Lord said to remove *Ananias's* Scruple about him,
 " Chap. ix. Ver. 11. *For behold he prayeth.*"

Ans. It is allowed that *Saul*, having pass'd through
 the State of Conviction, as it related to his then present
 Condition, had made some Progress in Conversion
 or Regeneration; but who will deny, that whatever he
 had experienced of this Nature, was the Effect of sancti-
 fying Grace, or spiritual Baptism.

Though his spiritual Purgation was not then com-
 pleted; his Sins were not washed away; yet so far as
 he was made a Member of the One Body, he was bapti-
 zed with the One Spirit, according to his own Doctrine,
 1 Cor. xii. 13. 'Tis plain that *Ananias* was sent to
Saul for two Reasons: First, That he might be resto-
 red to Sight. Secondly, That he should be filled with
 the Holy Ghost: And the 18th Verse relates the Ac-
 complishment of both, saying, *And immediately there*
fell from his Eyes as it had been Scales, and he receiveth
Sight forthwith. This was the fulfilling of the one Part
 of *Ananias's* Commission; and the other, viz. *That he*
should be filled with the Holy Ghost, is express'd, as being
 accomplished, in these Words, viz. *And he arose and*
was baptized.

But *J. B.* holds, that *Saul's* Reception of his Sight,
 and his being filled with the Holy Ghost, was fulfilled
 at one and the same Instant of Time, viz. before he was
 bid to arise and be baptized, &c. And farther says,
 " Who will attempt to say that *Saul* was not now con-
 " verted,

“verted, or that he had not received the Gift of the Holy Ghost in an extraordinary Manner?”

Answ. I might rather ask, Who besides *J. B.* would have asserted such a Thing, viz. That *Saul* was then endued with the Extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost?

First, Because it represents him to be so fill'd with the Holy Ghost, as to be endued with the Extraordinary Gifts thereof, even while his Sins were still remaining unwashed away.

Secondly, It makes Water-baptism more powerful and effectual than that with the Holy Ghost. Though he was even then, according to *J. B.*'s Opinion, under such an extraordinary Influence of sanctifying Grace, as to be said to be filled with the Holy Ghost; which *J. B.* himself owns to be the Baptism of the Spirit; and yet all this was so ineffectual for the Expurgation of his Sins, that material Water must be applied to effect it.

Thirdly, It supposes that *Ananias*, under divine Inspiration, did advise and direct one to call on the Name of the Lord, i. e. Pray or Supplicate for the Gift or Grace of the Holy Spirit, when at the same Instant of Time he was in the full Fruition thereof.

Such a Notion therefore must be acknowledged to be in every Respect highly absurd, and repugnant to the very Current of Scripture, as well as to the Reason and Nature of Things.

It is most consistent then to hold, that the second Part of *Ananias*'s Commission, viz. That *Saul* should be filled with the Holy Ghost, was not accomplished till after the Restoration of his Sight; and is necessarily imply'd in these Words, viz. *And he arose and was baptized*. The Apostle also himself giving a Relation of this Transaction, expresses it somewhat more distinctly, saying, that *Ananias* said to him, *Brother Saul, receive thy Sight*, (speaking imperatively, and ascribing the Act to *Ananias* as the instrumental Means) and then adds, *And the same Hour, (i. e. Instant) I looked up upon him*. Thus

Thus he gives the first Part of *Ananias's* Commission and Accomplishment thereof, conjunctly and distinct from the other, which was, *That he should be filled with the Holy Ghost*; and which the Apostle sets forth by the Phrase, *Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy Sins, calling on the Name of the Lord.*

This Passage is illustrated by what *Paul* himself tells the *Corinthians*, (some of whom had been great Sinners, as the same * shews) saying, *But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.*

This Place is almost parallel to that of *Acts ix. 17, 18.*—*xxii. 16.* The Apostle being very sensible how and by what Means himself was sanctified and washed from Sin, words the Matter much after the same Manner as *Ananias* had done to him; for as there is mention made that *Paul* should be filled with the Holy Ghost, and that the same might be accomplished, *de facto*, he was bid to be baptized and wash away his Sins, calling on the Name of the Lord, this (*1 Cor. vi. 11.*) says, that they were washed, and sanctified, and justified, in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.

So that these three Texts, viz. *Acts ix. 17, 18.*—*xxii. 16.* and *1 Cor. vi. 11.* are not only Consignificant, but explanatory of each other. The first tells us, that he was baptized; the second informs us, that it was such a Baptism as washed away Sins; the third expressly declares, that it is the Spirit of God that washes and sanctifies from Sin: What can be plainer, and a more natural Consequence, than that it was the Baptism of the Spirit?

To these Texts I shall add two more, viz. *But after that the Kindness of God our Saviour toward Man appeared, not by Works of Righteousness which we have done, but according to his Mercy he saved us, by the washing of Regeneration, and Renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ. Titus iii. 4, 5.* Seeing ye have purified your Souls, in obeying the Truth through the Spirit, *1 Pet. i. 22.*

But

* *1 Cor. vi. 11.*

But says *J. B.* "What Argument can be advanced to prove, that the Posture of the Body is necessary to the Conversion of the Soul?"

Ans. It is strange he should be so inconsiderate and insensible of the Nature of the Case, as to propound so empty a Question.

Was his being commanded *to arise*,* a necessary Inference that, it was in order for his being baptized with Water? Is there an inseparable Connexion betwixt the Erection or Exsuscitation of the Body and Water-baptism? Or will he say, that all Postures of the Body are equally indifferent for the Cultivation or Improvement of the Mind? Or that some are not more convenient than others for certain Religious Exercises? Would *J. B.* think it as suitable for his Hearers to lye prostrate on the Earth, or walk about, when he preaches or prays amongst them, as decently to sit or stand?

When *Ananias* came to *Saul*, he had been three Days blind, and without Eating or Drinking; and almost swallow'd up of Grief for the Evil he had done, and intended yet farther to have done, against so gracious and merciful a God.

Ananias therefore finding him in such a dejected State both of Body and Mind, it might be very expedient, as soon as he was restor'd to Sight, to bid him arise into a Posture more sociable and conversible, that he might the more conveniently communicate what he had farther to dispense, as the instrumental Means of his Reception of the Holy Ghost, or that Baptism which could wash away Sins; and that the same is not Water-baptism, we have already shewn.

So that this Portion of Scripture, which my Opponent produc'd to refute our Doctrine, very plainly confirms it; and the said Text being taken in Conjunction with *1 Cor. vi. 11. Tit. iii. 4, 5. 1 Pet. i. 22.* makes it more evidently appear on our Side of the Question.

* Tho' indeed the Word *ἀναστῆς*, *Ast. xxii. 16.* has no necessary relation to any Posture of the Body; but is frequently used by way of Excitement to a Duty required.

As to *J. B's* Comment on *Acts* xxii. 16. viz. "Come arise from thy pensive Posture and take a View of Christ in thy Baptism, as dying for thy Sins, and rising again for thy Justification; see how thy Sins are remitted hereby." It sounds nothing like Scripture Language; it bears no Resemblance of the Spirit of Religion, but is a Piece of meer Formality, invented to quadrate with his own erroneous Scheme, and quite foreign to the Nature of the Evangelical Dispensation, as may, perhaps, farther appear in the Sequel of this Answer.

Pag. 101. "Thirdly, If Conversion or Regeneration is the spiritual Baptism, then must the Opposers of Water-baptism either acknowledge that the converted Goaler's Household was baptized with Water, or else shew us for what Reason they went out of their House to receive the spiritual Baptism, since their being in the House could not obstruct the Reception of any spiritual Blessing."

Answer. Although he insists on it here, and also in his other Pamphlet, call'd *A Treatise of Baptism*, wrote against the *Pedo-baptists*, pag. 12. that the Goaler's Family went out of the House to be baptized, yet it is not expressed in the Text, *Acts* xvi. 33. nor is it necessarily understood.

The Place he refers to is Verse 34, which says, *And when he had brought them into his House, he set Meat before them and rejoiced, believing in God with all his House.*

And though in the next preceding Verse it is said, *He was baptized and all his straightway*—yet is there not any thing here that implies that he and his Family went out of the House to be baptized, or that they were not baptized in the House. What farther can be gathered from hence, than that the Goaler brought the Apostles *Paul* and *Silas* into his Dwelling-house, or some suitable Place he had to accommodate himself and particular Friends in, from the Room, or Prison, where he had placed them, to dress their Wounds or Stripes, when he brought them out of the Stocks in the inner Prison or Dungeon, Verse 30? That

That the Apostles took the Goaler and his Household without Doors to any River or Pool to dip them therein, the Text is wholly silent, and 'tis not very likely, considering the Time of the Night, Verse 25: How then could J. B. have the Assurance so positively to assert it, and ground two decisive Arguments thereon, the one against the *Sprinklers*, and the other against the *Quakers*?

If he had taken the Advice to himself here, which he so often gives to others, pag. 11. viz. "Not to venture at Uncertainties," he would perhaps have shunn'd thus peremptorily asserting what he can't support by Scripture.

Pag. 102. "But if they rather chuse to acknowledge that this was Baptism with Water, then here is another famous Instance yielded to us, which I judge they will submit to, rather than attempt to engage with the Difficulty that will attend the Denial hereof."

Though he positively says, "then here is another famous Instance yielded to us," yet 'tis untrue in both Parts, if I understand his Meaning by the Adjective [another] which I suppose relates to the next preceding Instance concerning *Ananias* and *Saul*, which is so far from being yielded, that I think it is sufficiently disproved.

Why he should imagine that it would be yielded I can't conceive, unless he fancied his Arguments would prove unanswerable, or that he had to do with a very credulous Antagonist.

And as to this of the Goaler, I do not remember that we ever determin'd any thing positively about it, or insisted on its not meaning Water-baptism. How then could we possibly yield it? Can that which was never held in Possession, or so much as claim'd, be properly said to be yielded? I admire he should speak so unguardedly as he often does!

Who would have thought that any Person so ignorant of our Principles and Writings, as not to know whether

ied *Acts* xvi. 33. to imply Water-baptism, or not,

should ever attempt to write against us on the Subject of Baptism.

And how doth this bear upon his Ingenuity and Moderation too, in presuming to represent us as insisting upon it to mean the *Baptism of the Spirit*, when for ought that appears he is ignorant respecting our Sentiments about it?

With relation to the Difficulty he speaks of, it concerns not us, but himself, who hath repeatedly affirmed what he will find not very easy to make clearly apparent.

I do not think that this *Opponent* has a right Understanding of what he is about: Suppose it were granted him for Argument's Sake, that all these Places he speaks of meant Water-baptism, what would it avail to prove his Point, *viz.* That Conversion or Regeneration is not the Baptism of the *Spirit*? Why, nothing at all.

What odd Sort of *Logick* would it be to say? Because *Acts* xxii. 16. & xvi. 33. intend Water-baptism, Therefore Conversion is not the Baptism of the Spirit. So it is very discernable, that these Reasons of his amount just to nothing to the purpose for which he brought them.

Let's now pass to his Fourth Reason.

“*Fourthly*, If Conversion or Regeneration is the Baptism of the Spirit, then does it seem altogether unreasonable that our Lord should fix Damnation upon Unbelief, and not upon a Failure of Baptism, in *Mark* xvii. 16. Since Conversion includes Faith and other Graces implanted in the Soul of the Regenerate, as *Hope, Love, Humility, &c.*”

Ans. Why should he any more admire, or think it unreasonable, that our Lord should fix Damnation upon Unbelief here, than in other Places, as *John* viii. 24, *For if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your Sins.* The Author to the *Hebrews*, Chap. iii. 19. makes Unbelief that which excludes from the Favour of God. *Ibid.* Chap. xi. 6. That without Faith it is impossible to please God. *Well: because of Unbelief they were broken off,* *Rom.* xi. 20.

Why

Why did he not charge these Texts with Unreasonableness too, because Regeneration was not used instead of Faith or Belief? 'Tis much he did not find Fault with the Apostle for not adding *Charity* to *Faith*, because *Paul* himself makes *Faith* without *Charity* no better than *sounding Brass*.

The Apostle *Peter* ascribes to *Faith* the peculiar Property of *Spiritual Baptism*, saying, *God put no Difference between us and them, purifying their Hearts by Faith*, Acts xv. 9.

Again, if *J. B.* will read *John* iii. 3, 5. he may observe that Damnation, or an Exclusion from future Happiness, is fixt upon the Failure of Regeneration or *Spiritual Baptism* only, without naming *Faith*. So that our Saviour alters the Terms according to the Circumstances and States of those to whom his Speeches were directed.

But *J. B.* proceeding says, "And I think it is one of the most inconsistent Things in the World to suppose, that a converted or regenerate Man should be an Unbeliever."

Who ever supposed such a Thing except *J. B.* himself? For he has not offered the least Shadow of Proof, or in any wise made it appear, that such is the natural Consequence of the Text, *Mark* xvi. 16. holding the Baptism there mentioned to be that of the Spirit. But, supposing (but not granting) it to mean Water-baptism, doth this make Regeneration ever the less necessary? And is there not the same Reason, to infer that Damnation should have been fixt upon the Failure thereof, and not upon *Unbelief* only? Therefore it is very plain that his Allegations are as strong against himself; but he sees it not!

Let's now examine the Text a little, in order to vindicate the Orthodoxy of our Lord's Expressions, in the Sense wherein we take 'em. *And he said unto them, Go ye into all the World and preach the Gospel to every Creature.*

This is all the Evangelist *Mark* gives us respecting the Apostles Commission, in which there is no mention of

Baptism, or baptizing; what is enjoin'd them as their Duty to perform is, *to preach the Gospel*; yet that their Preaching should be attended with a baptizing Efficacy is plain from the next Words, which set forth the Effect of their Ministry, and what it should produce in the well-disposed Hearers. *He that believes and is baptized, shall be saved*, Verse 16. i. e. Your preaching the Gospel shall be so powerful and efficacious as to produce *Faith*, and confer the baptizing and sanctifying Influences of the Holy Ghost; and is the same in Substance with *Mat. xxviii. 19. Teach all Nations, baptizing them into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*

To preach the Gospel to the Production of * *Faith* and Ministrations of saving Baptism, is equivalent to *Teach baptizing into the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.* And as *Mark*, who wrote after *Matthew*, delivering the same Commission, leaves out [*baptizing, &c.*] yet implies or comprehends it in the Words *Preach the Gospel*; it is an Indication that Baptizing was not an Exercise distinct from Teaching or Preaching, but the proper Effect thereof, and included therein.

These Words of Christ, *Mark xvi. 16.* as they set forth the Efficacy of a Gospel Ministry, and the Terms of Salvation, *quoad nos*, i. e. with respect to us; so they contain a certain, eternal, and infallible Truth, holding good at all Times and in all Places, *whoever believes and is baptized, shall be saved.*

If this be held to be the Baptism of the Spirit, or the sanctifying and regenerating Power of the Holy Ghost, it will be certainly and eternally true. But this can by no means be allow'd of Water-baptism, we have a plain Instance of Scripture against it, viz. the Case of *Simon Magus*; for it is expressly said, that *he believed and was baptized*, yet was in the *Gall of Bitterness and Bond of Iniquity*; and daily Experience tells us, there are many Thousands who pass through the like Administration, and yet are as remote from a State of Salvation as he was.

If therefore we believe that these Words of our Lord are infallibly true, as 'tis most certain they are, it is necessary to maintain that it is the Baptism of the Spirit which is there intended: And this Construction is supported by what Christ himself said to *Nicodemus*, John iii. 3. where Regeneration, as the same is the Effect of spiritual Baptism (express'd by the Terms *Water* and *Spirit*) is made the *sine qua non*, or that without which none can be saved; and likewise by what the Apostle says, viz. *By one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, bond or free.* 1 Cor. xii. 13.

As touching the other Expression of our Lord's, viz. *He that believeth not shall be damned*, it is equally absolute and infallible with the foregoing.

It is as impossible for any to be saved in *Unbelief*, as it would be for a Person who has a long Journey to go, that he should accomplish the same without ever advancing one Step on the Road. *Faith* being the first Step and Introduction, or what commences our Christian Progress; the Failure of that is a total Prevention and Anticipation of farther Proficiency.

As both *Faith* and *Baptism* are made necessary for Salvation, so *Unbelief* alone is sufficient to exclude; since he that believes not cannot possibly be * baptized.

Thus I think it is clearly evident, that this Doctrine of the *Baptism of the Spirit* is so far from being attended with any Inconsistence, that it avoids those Inconveniences and Absurdities which the Assertors of Water-baptism are inevitably plung'd into, respecting this very Text.

Page 103. " What the Apostle saith to the converted *Jews*, Acts ii. 38. plainly sheweth that Conversion is not the Baptism of the Spirit; and that " Water-baptism must be there intended: *Repent and " be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus " Christ*

* If he that believes not, is consequently not baptized, then what attends or is fix'd upon the Failure of the one, extends to or includes the Failure of the other also.

“ *Christ for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost.* Now that the Apostle means here the wonderful Effusions of the Holy Ghost, that they had seen but just before upon the Apostles and Disciples, is very evident.”

Ans. How *Acts* ii. 38. plainly shews that Conversion is not the Baptism of the Spirit, or rather the Effect thereof, I apprehend not, unless it is because he says so: However, he thinks this Place must intend Water-baptism, or else the Apostle's Words here will not be consistent with good Sense, but will make him speak after this manner, *Repent and be baptized with the Holy Ghost, and ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.*

But let him consider, that it is not an uncommon thing in Scripture to declare of the frequent and repeated Influences and Endowments of the Holy Spirit: As for Instance, Those mentioned under the Similitude of *Talents* and *Pounds*, *Mat.* xxv. *Luke* xix. He who had received *five*, had for his Improvement thereof, or rather thro' faithful Obedience to such Manifestations, *five* more added; and he that had received *his Pound*, for the right Use thereof, had the Addition of *Nine* more: I call it an *Addition*, because the Increase as well as the Principal descend from above; for it is no more in the Power of Man to increase than procure the Principal; all are the free Gifts of Heaven, through faithful Obedience to the smallest Manifestations; so that this may be called, *Grace* for (the right Use, or Obedience to the Requirings of) *Grace*: *Paul* says, *1 Cor.* iv. 7. *What hast thou that thou didst not receive*; and in his Epistle to *Titus* he makes mention of the Renewing of the spiritual Baptism, or sanctifying Operation of the Holy Ghost, *But according to his Mercy he saved us, by the Washing of Regeneration and Renewing of the Holy Ghost*, *Tit.* iii. 5. These, and many other Places, denote the frequent Visits and renewed Influences of the Holy Spirit, for perfecting the Work of Regeneration. And what Absurdity

can be any more inferr'd from * *Acts* iii. 37. than from *Mat.* xxv. *Luke* xix. &c. Is there not a repeated Communication of the Spirit necessarily implied in the one as well as the other? Is it any more Tautology to say, *Repent and be converted in the Name of the Lord Jesus for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost*, than it would be to say, *Receive one Talent, Manifestation or Measure of the Spirit, and improve the same, and thou shalt receive more?*

Secondly, That *to be baptized* † here implies *to be converted*, is exactly agreeable to what the same Apostle says in the very next ¶ Chapter, viz. *Repent and be converted that your Sins may be blotted out.*

Remission of Sins, Washing away Sins, and Blotting out Sins, importing one and the same Thing, viz. a Purgation or Cleansing from inward Corruption and Defilement, requires one and the same Cause to produce it, viz. The Efficacy of the Spirit.

What is implied by the Words *be baptized* in the one Text, is explain'd in the other by the Words *be converted*: Therefore *to be baptized* and *to be converted*, having one and the same End and Effect assign'd thereunto, require one and the same Operation.

Pag. 104. “ But if our Opponents perceive the Injustice of this Opinion, and rather chuse to allow that the Apostle does intend here Water-baptism, through a Mistake of his Master's Commission, I answer, That hereby they run themselves upon a more dangerous Rock; for certainly it must be impossible that he should mistake herein.”

Ans. We are so far from perceiving such an Opinion to be attended with any Injustice, that we think it appears to be both just and reasonable. But should we, for Argument's Sake, allow it to be Water-baptism, I deny his Consequence, viz. That it would run us upon a dangerous Rock, or reflect Dishonour upon the Apostle and the Spirit of Christ. And

* By understanding the Word *baptized* to mean *converted*.

† *Acts* ii. 38.

¶ *Acts* iii. 9.

And *first*, Is it not strange that he should have the Assurance to affirm, that it must certainly be impossible that *Peter* should mistake his Master's Commission, when it is so plain and obvious that both he and the other Apostles did mistake in a principal Part thereof. Doth not the Commission bid them *Go teach all Nations?* and yet (according to *Chronology*) eight Years after this extraordinary Effusion of the Spirit on the Day of *Pentecost*, not only *Peter*, but the rest too, judged it unlawful to teach the *Gentiles*, (which was 'by far the greatest Part of the Commission) until they were better inform'd, and their Understanding rectified, by a miraculous Vision. See the 10th and 11th of the *Acts*.

Is *J. B.* a Teacher of others, and an Expositor of the Scripture, and yet ignorant of this? And not only so, but does he assert that it was certainly impossible that such a Thing should be? Had he perus'd the sacred Records, he might have found that the Apostles, &c. not only mistook, relating to this, the major Part of their Commission, but also that they were so far misapprehensive of the Gospel Dispensation and Kingdom of Christ, that even at the very Time of his Ascension they expected it would have been Earthly and Temporal. The Text says, *When they therefore were gathered together they asked him, saying, Lord wilt thou at this Time again restore the Kingdom to Israel?* Acts i. 6. And this was after they receiv'd the Commission.

Seeing that it is undeniably true, from plain matter of Fact, that the Apostles did for some Time mistake a more material Part of the Commission than Water-baptism can reasonably be supposed to be, it is *J. B.*'s Province to shew, why their Mistake touching the latter, (allowing them to have made such) should any more reflect Dishonour upon the Apostles and the Spirit of Christ, than the same in the former. If their Mistake in the lesser must reflect Dishonour, as he asserts, certainly their Mistake in the greater must reflect more.

Ibid. " No Man shall perswade me to believe, that
 " our gracious and faithful Redeemer would oblige his
 " Apostles

“ Apostles and Ministers to do any Thing in his Name,
 “ &c. and not give them a true and distinct Account
 “ of his Meaning.”

Ans. I am in the same Mind with *J. B.* here; for undoubtedly had our Lord intended Water-baptism, he would have given them a full and distinct Account of his Meaning, both with respect to Time, Place, Persons, and Mode of Performance; and not have left Men in perpetual Obscurity and Confusion, as the Maintainers of this Ceremony have been, still are, and like to be, until they forsake the Shadow and turn to the Substance.

How easy would it have been for the Oracle of Wisdom to have clearly determined and settled those Particulars, about which the continual Variance and Contention have been? How intelligibly, plainly and distinctly was every Ritual of the *Mosaic* Law deliver'd? There was not any room for Ignorance, Discord or Confusion about 'em. But inasmuch as there is not the least Hint or Intimation of any such necessary Instructions for the Performance of Water-baptism, 'tis an Indication that the same was not intended by our Lord in his Commission.

Ibid. “ I am not at all scrupulous but that the Apostles well understood their Lord and Master's Commission, which must of necessity be very plain to them, since he had obliged them to administer it in the adorable and venerable Names of God.”

Ans. Nor am I at all scrupulous, but that the Apostles understood the Commission very plainly not to relate to Water-baptism; and therefore when they occasionally administered it, we do not find that they ever made use of those Names, *viz.* of the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, as a Form of Words.

It cannot reasonably be thought, that if the Apostles had taken *Mat.* xxviii. 19. as a Precept of Christ concerning Water-baptism, that they would, in any Instance, have omitted the Form. That Christ obliged his Apostles to administer Water baptism in those Names, as *J. B.* asserts, is the Thing in question, and what he should

have prov'd, but that's a Matter in which he is as defective as the rest who wrote before him. As for his positively asserting it, he might have saved himself that Trouble, because it has been frequently done already by others.——But more of this hereafter.

Pag. 105. “ *Sixtly*, It is very evident, that Conversion or Regeneration is not the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, from what a greater than *Peter* has said, viz. from what *Peter's* Lord and Master said to him, and the rest of the Apostles, a little before his Ascension to Glory, when he was pleased to inform them, that in a few Days they should be honoured with the spiritual Baptism, Acts i. 5. *For John truly baptized with Water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many Days hence.* This plainly implieth, that the Apostles had not as yet been baptized with the spiritual Baptism. But if Regeneration is the Baptism of the Spirit, then were they baptized therewith before, and it must be superfluous to inform them, that the Time for its taking place upon them was near at hand. Therefore, unless it can be proved that the Apostles of Christ were not converted before the Day of *Pentecost*, the Text will stand an immoveable Argument, and a perpetual Monument against the Opposers of Water-baptism. But I am confident, that an Attempt to disprove the Conversion of the Apostles till the Day of *Pentecost*, (when they were baptized with the Spirit) will prove an exceeding Difficult, yea, an impossible Task.”

Answer. This he has reserv'd as the last of his Reasons to prove the People called *Quakers* mistaken respecting the Baptism of the Spirit, and I have inserted it at length lest he should say I had abridg'd it of its Force by Contraction.

That he esteems it of no small Validity, is apparent from the extraordinary Epithets he bestows thereon, viz. *immoveable Argument, perpetual Monument, &c.* But I have reason to think that the Unbiaffed will plainly perceive, that this *Immoveability* and *Perpetuity* he seems to boast

boast of, is rather imaginary than real. Because our Saviour told his Apostles that *they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many Days hence*, meaning on the Day of *Pentecost*, J. B. entertains a strong Opinion that they were never baptized with the Spirit before that Time. But what Proof has he given for this? Has he render'd any Reason sufficient to evince that these Words of Christ do necessarily imply it? Nothing farther than his bare *say so*. Wherefore the whole Strength and *Immoveability* of his Assertion is meerly conjectural and imaginary, being grounded upon a preconceived Notion of the Author, without any Colour of Reason or Scriptural Authority to support it: So being destitute of the proper Motives of Credibility, it has nothing intrinsic to recommend it, or procure an Assent in the Minds of the Judicious. And though I am not strictly obliged, by the Rules of Controversy, to return him any other Answer than to deny his Inference, and put him upon the Proof of his Assertion, yet shall offer something by way of Examination, for his Sake as well as some of his Readers.

What he has deliver'd consists of two Parts, viz. *First*, That the Apostles were not baptized with the Spirit before the *Day of Pentecost*, when the Holy Ghost descended in an extraordinary Manner; for after he has repeated *Acts* i. 5. he says, "This plainly implieth, that the Apostles had not as yet been baptized with the Spiritual Baptism."

Secondly, That it is impossible to disprove the Conversion of the Apostles till the *Day of Pentecost*. To each of these I shall reply as followeth,

To the *First*, That the Apostles were not baptized with the spiritual Baptism before the *Day of Pentecost*. Let us see how this agrees with some other of his Assertions. In pag. 107, he says, "The Baptism of the Spirit was extraordinary and miraculous, and produced most surprizing and wonderful Effects; was obvious not only to the Persons who experienced it, but also to all Beholders, whose Eyes and Ears were

“ witness to the Effects thereof.” This is his Definition of spiritual Baptism. Now to try whether the Apostles were (according to *J. B's* own Doctrine) baptized with the Spirit before the Time he speaks of, we have only to examine, whether they were endued with such a Gift of the Spirit as produced such Effects as come within the Limits of his Definition.

We read in several Places of Scripture, viz. *Mat. x. Luke ix.* that the Apostles had Power to *heal the Sick, Cleanse the Lepers, Raise the Dead, and cast out Devils.*

First, That the Apostles performed these Miracles by the Power of the Holy Ghost, I suppose it will be readily granted.

Secondly, That the same were surprising and wonderful Effects, obvious not only to the Persons who experienced this Divine Power in themselves, (through whom as instrumental Means the said Effects were produced) but also to all Beholders, who were Eye and Ear Witnesses thereof, must, I presume, be allow'd by every one who acknowledges the Truth of the Relation of those Texts; for what can be more wonderful and surprising than to raise dead Persons to Life, dispossess Devils, &c. The Consequence is most natural, viz. That as often as the Apostles were endued with Power to produce such Miracles, so often were they baptized with the spiritual Baptism. Therefore, pursuant to *J. B's* own Doctrine, the Apostles were several Times baptized with the Spirit before the Day of *Pentecost*, since it will not be denied, that they often wrought such Miracles.

By this the Reader may have a Taste of the Confusion and Inconsistency of my *Antagonist's* Scheme; and that his Assertions do mutually oppose and destroy each other.

To the *Second*, viz. That it is impossible to disprove the Apostles Conversion, &c. I shall answer out of *Dr. Burkit* on *Mat. xiii. 1, 2, 3.* “ No Sins, says he, are
“ more odious and abominable in the Sight of God
“ than Pride and Ambition. *Secondly*, That Persons
“ already converted stand in need of farther Conver-
“ sion; they that are converted from a State of Sin,
“ may

“ may want to be converted from a particular Act of
 “ Sin, this was the Apostles Case here: They were
 “ turned from a Course of Sin, but they wanted a Con-
 “ version from a particular Act of Sin, *to wit*, from
 “ Ambition.” On *Mat. xx. 20, 21, 22.* “ Note
 “ how these Disciples did still dream of Christ’s Tem-
 “ poral Kingdom——and ambitiously seek to have
 “ the Preference and Preheminence in that Kingdom !
 “ ——They were greatly ignorant of the Nature and
 “ Quality of his Kingdom, which was not Secular, but
 “ Heavenly ; but the carnal Motive of a glorious
 “ Earthly Kingdom upon Earth, in which they should
 “ be deliver’d from the *Roman* Power, was so deeply
 “ imprinted in their Minds, that they frequently de-
 “ clar’d their Expectation of it, notwithstanding all the
 “ Assurances which Christ had given them of the con-
 “ trary.”——On *Acts i. 6.* “ I know not any thing
 “ wherein the Bishop of *Rome* may so properly call him-
 “ self Apostolical, as in following this Error of the
 “ Apostles ; they were always dreaming of a Temporal
 “ Kingdom, so is he always doting upon it.”——On
Mat. xviii. i. “ Notwithstanding our blessed Saviour
 “ had so often told his Disciples, that *his Kingdom was not*
 “ *of this World*, yet they still dreamed of a Temporal
 “ and Earthly Kingdom——and accordingly at this
 “ Time, the Ambition of the Disciples led them to en-
 “ quire of our Saviour who should have the chiefest
 “ Place of Honour and Dignity in his Kingdom.”

To this of *Birkit*, I add a Passage from *Dr. Adams’s*
Sermons, pag. 498, 499.

“ Whatever Care our Saviour took to enlighten
 “ and inflame the Minds of his Disciples, yet finding
 “ them full of Prejudice, Strife, and Ambition ; over-
 “ run with gross Ignorance and Error ; their Hearts,
 “ for the present, incapable of receiving divine
 “ Truths ; their Faith weak and unstable ; their Love
 “ to God and Man cold and languishing ; he sent
 “ the Holy Ghost to be a wise and uncorrupted
 “ Spirit of Understanding and Truth, to perfect
 “ their

" their Faith; to be a clear, pure, quick and live-
 " ly Spirit of Ardour, to compleat their Chari-
 " ty. And since the Apostles were not only to be
 " convinced themselves, that the *Jewish* Dispensation
 " was to be abrogated, and Salvation to reach the
 " *Gentiles*, but were also to publish the Christian Re-
 " ligion to all Nations.

" Therefore the Holy Ghost came upon them. ———

" All this, I say, is a sensible Image of the Greatness
 " of the Majesty and Love of God, when he designed
 " to operate in the Breasts of the Apostles, to enable
 " them to compleat their own and other Mens Salva-
 " tion, and to remove all Ignorance, Error and Pre-
 " judice; all sordid and earthly Affections from
 " them: And this is what the Holy Ghost effected,
 " when he descended upon the Apostles like *fiery*
 " *Tongues*, teaching them to cast away their former
 " Fears and Weaknesses; their Want of Faith and
 " secret Murmurings; their Love of Preference, and
 " their ambitious Desires to rule over one another;
 " their indifferent Scruples and hardness of Heart,
 " which Christ reproached them with. So that here
 " we may say, even in this Sense, the Holy Ghost was
 " a *consuming Fire*; full of active, ardent, and puri-
 " fying Love, that leaves no Corruption in the Soul,
 " but carries it to the clearest Apprehension of the
 " most exalted Truths, and the faithful and indefati-
 " gable Practice of the most eminent Virtues. So great,
 " so sudden, and amazing a Change, was wrought in
 " the Apostles by the Influence of the blessed Spirit's
 " Instruction, insomuch, that they who before were
 " for being greatest and sitting upon Thrones in
 " Christ's Kingdom, had now learned Humility, and
 " each was ready to acknowledge himself the meanest
 " Disciple.

It is plain that the Apostles were partly *Jews* by
 Profession till Christ's Passion, if not some time after;
 and though they were sent forth, and endued with Power
 to work Miracles, and preach the Doctrine of Repen-
 tance,

tance, and to proclaim that the Kingdom of Heaven, or Gospel-Dispensation, was near approaching, yet were they still under the *Jewish* Oeconomy, in the Observation and Servitude of the *ceremonial Law*, both in Speculation and Practice.

Though they were some Years, as we may suppose, favoured with the personal Ministry, and most intimate Converse and Instruction of the *Messiah*, yet they had not a clear Knowledge, either of him as he was the Eternal Son of God, or the End of his Coming. Tho' he frequently endeavoured to inculcate upon them a Sense of his Sufferings, Death, Burial, Resurrection, &c. yet they were still in Ignorance and Unbelief. *Peter* rebuked him when he mentioned it; and after his *Passion*, when the Woman, who had been at the Sepulchre, declared to the *Eleven*, and all the rest, what they had seen and heard to convince them of the Certainty of his Resurrection; yet the Evangelist says, that *their Words seemed to them as idle Tales, and they believed them not.* And by the Discourse of two of them, who were going the same Day to *Emmaus*, it appears, that they accounted him but some great Prophet sent by God for the Deliverance of the *Jews* from the *Roman* Bondage; * *Jesus of Nazareth*, said they, *who was a Prophet mighty indeed and in Word before God, &c.*—*We trusted that it had been he who should have redeemed Israel.* And this Notion of his being a *temporal Saviour*, was so deeply rooted in their Minds, that it remained with them until the very Time of his Ascension, if not after; notwithstanding he had so frequently conversed with them for the Space of forty Days after his Resurrection, and taught them in many Things appertaining to the Gospel Dispensation.

I now leave it to the Reader, and the second Consideration of my *Antagonist*, upon what is here delivered, Whether the Apostles, in such a State, could not possibly

possibly want Conversion ; and that in more Particulars than one relating to the Gospel Dispensation.

Having, as I conceive, sufficiently spoke to what he calls his *Negative* Part ; let's now examine what he calls his *Positive*.

Pag. 160. " I shall now, says he, proceed to the
 " positive Part of the Question, which is to shew,
 " what I understand the Baptism of the Holy Ghost to
 " be. — I cannot believe, as many Authors do,
 " that the blessed Work of the Holy Spirit in Rege-
 " nerating of us, which is common to all true Believers,
 " is the Baptism of the Spirit ; nor do we read
 " any where in all the Scripture, that it is so called :
 " And therefore I judge that all such as esteem the
 " New Birth this Baptism, are greatly mistaken here-
 " in ; and that they say what they are not able to
 " prove, either by Scripture or Argument. But I do,
 " with some others, believe, that the Baptism of the
 " Spirit and Regeneration (or being born of the Spirit)
 " are two things ; and that the Spiritual Baptism does
 " consist in those extraordinary and wonderful Effusi-
 " ons of the Spirit, which were poured forth upon Be-
 " lievers in the Apostles Days."

Answer. If I have disproved his *Negative* Part, as I think I have fairly done, that is comprehensive of his *Positive* ; for if it be proved that Conversion or Regeneration is, or implies the Baptism of the Spirit, his Negation thereof, as well as his Attempt to restrain it to the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost, as speaking with Tongues, &c. become invalid. And methinks his denying that the Scripture any where calls that Gift of the Spirit, which is common to all Believers, and necessary for the Work of Regeneration, the Baptism of the Spirit ; and also his asserting, that we are greatly mistaken herein, and say what we are not able to prove, either by Scripture or Argument, is a very lame Way of Disputing ; unless he had examined the several Texts, and refuted the Arguments for the Probation, and Confirmation of our Opinion and Doctrine. But so very miserably

miserably deficient is my *Opponent* in this; that he has entirely past by all that *R. Barclay* and I have advanced on this Topic. In my *Reply* to the *Norfolk Letter*, by *P. Bedingfield*, &c. (who, as well as *O. Edwards* in *Dublin*, held the same erroneous Notion with *J. B.* about the spiritual Baptism,) I treated, *ex professo*, of this very Point, for the Space of 18 Pages, endeavouring to prove the same by Scripture and Authority. All which *J. B.* has wholly evaded, passing them over in profound Silence, and states the Question afresh, as if no Manner of Reply had been made thereunto.

Who would have thought that any Person, pretending to be an Author or Disputant, would have manifested so much Disingenuity? To conceal what we have offered, and charge us to the World, with asserting what we are not able to prove, either by Scripture or Argument, when we have so amply discuss'd the Matter, and as we conceive, fully and clearly proved it, both by Scripture and Argument, and corroborated the same by many Authorities, is a proceeding very unfair in Controversy.

I shall not here repeat what I have delivered in my other Book on this Head, but refer the Reader thereto for his Satisfaction; and do call upon *J. B.* to answer the same, since it now directly points at him as its proper *Antagonist*.

When I have further examined what he calls his *Positive*, I shall subjoin something in Order to prove the Necessity of Spiritual Baptism, and in Disproof of my *Opponents* Assertion under Examination. And first, let it be observed, That this Position in his *Positive* Part evidently disagrees with his *Negative*. In *that* he denies, that the Baptism of the Spirit was known before the Day of *Pentecost*, mentioned in the 2d. of the *Acts*. But in *this* he extends it to the former Dispensations. It consists in that Communication of the Spirit which produced surprizing and wonderful Effects, that were obvious both to the Persons who experienced it, and to the

Beholders, as he asserts : How frequently then were *Moses* and the Prophets baptized, who were often endued with such a Measure of the Spirit as produced such Effects ? Does not this plainly shew that he is in Confusion ; one Part of his Discourse operating in repugnance to the other ? Having made this short Observation, let's return to the Thread of his Discourse.

Pag. 107. " The New-birth or Conversion, which
" is common to all the People of God, is no more the
" Baptism of the Holy Ghost, than that common Afflictions is the Baptism of Afflictions."

Because our Lord call'd his Afflictions *Baptism*, doth it necessarily follow thence, that no less Degree may be so denominated ? Did not Christ allow those of his Apostles to be such ? And will *J. B.* say their Afflictions were equal to his, who bore our Infirmities and suffered for the Sins of the World ? If our Redeemer was pleased to call the Afflictions of his Apostles and immediate Followers, *Baptism*, (though vastly inferior to his own) why may not the Afflictions that attend other Christians or Followers of the same crucified Jesus be called Baptism also, though they may be inferior to those of the Apostles ? If *J. B.* still persists in the contrary Opinion, let him, in his *Next*, shew something more convincing than his bare *ipse dixit*.

Pag. 108. " *Obj.* But does not what the Apostle
" Paul says to the *Corinthians* prove the Continuance of
" the spiritual Baptism, when he tells them, that by
" one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body, whether we
" be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, 1 Cor.
" xii. 13. *Answer.* No surely ; for I think it appears
" plain, that this Text is designed only to shew that
" God had broken down the Partition Wall that before
" stood between the *Jews* and *Gentiles* ; and that now
" there is no Difference between one and another, in
" reference to their Spiritual and Ecclesiastical State,
" as there was under the former Dispensation. —
" This therefore was given as a certain and infallible
" Token, that now they were acknowledged one Body."

I cannot

I cannot entirely agree with J. B. that this Text, 1 Cor. xii. 13. is *designed only to shew that God had broken down the Partition Wall, &c.* but am rather inclinable to think, that its Intent and Meaning is according to what it expressly declares, *viz. By one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body, &c.* Yet nevertheless I freely allow, that this, as well as the other Texts, which make mention of the Progress of the Gospel among the *Gentiles*, doth necessarily imply the Demolition of the Separation Wall betwixt *Jew* and *Gentile*. But then this makes directly against my Antagonist's Notion of the Spirit's Baptism being always attended with the Gift of Tongues, and expiring with the Lives of the Apostles. For, if the Apostle intends, by the Phrase *being baptized by one Spirit into one Body*, such a Measure or Communication of the Spirit as was designed to shew, or was a signal or infallible Token, that the Separation between *Jews* and *Gentiles* was removed, as J. B. says, and that Redemption and Salvation through Christ's Death was as universally extended to the *Gentiles* as to the *Jews*, the same must have been such a Measure or Gift of the Spirit as did accompany Salvation, and necessary for every believing *Gentile*, as well as *Jew*, to experience in himself in the Production of the New Creature: Which that this is, we are fully of the Judgment; for if *by this Body* is meant the Body of Christ, of which true Believers are Members in particular, according to 1 Cor. xii. 27, then it must needs be that this *one Spirit* is the Spirit of Christ, by which all are baptized into the one Body the Church, and so is the common Privilege of every true Believer, according to the Apostle, 1 Cor. xii. 7. That a *Manifestation of the Spirit is given to every Man to profit withal*: And if this Spirit is the common Privilege of every true Believer, and is the Sap of the *true Vine*, spoken of in *John* xv. 1, to 6. which causes every Branch to bring forth Fruit, as it certainly is; and the more general Effusion thereof (which before was more peculiar to the Seed of *Abraham*, or Church of the *Jews*) is the taking away the

Partition Wall, whereby both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, *bond* and *free*, become one, as according to this Text it is: Then *J. B.*'s Exposition destroys it self, and proves the direct contrary to what it was brought for, or was intended by it. And farther he says,

Pag. 110. " Sure then the Apostle *Paul*, in the
 " Text now under Consideration, could not intend
 " that the Spiritual Baptism was to continue through-
 " out the future Ages of Christianity, or that it was
 " experienced in the World before the Day of *Pentecost*,
 " any more than that *Abraham*, *Isaac*, *Jacob*, and the
 " rest of the Patriarchs before *Moses*, and all the El-
 " ders of *Israel* after *Moses* to the Apostles Days, could
 " be said to be baptized to *Moses*, in the Cloud, and
 " in the Sea, because the Apostle tells the *Corinthians*,
 " *All our Fathers were under the Cloud, and all passed*
 " *through the Sea, and were all baptized to Moses in the*
 " *Cloud and in the Sea, 1 Cor. x. 1, 2.*"

Answ. How weak and impertinent is our Opponent here? He endeavours to represent the sanctifying, baptizing Influences of the Holy Spirit, respecting its Administration and Continuance in the Church of Christ, to be as temporary and transient as was the *Israelites* passing through the Red Sea, and under the Cloud in the Wildernels! Because *Abraham*, *Isaac*, *Jacob*, and the rest of the Patriarchs who died before *Moses* was born, were not baptized unto *Moses* under the Cloud, and in the Sea: *Ergo*, None were baptized with the Spirit before the Day of *Pentecost*. Again,

Because all the *Israelites* after *Moses*'s Death, to the Apostles Days, were not baptized unto *Moses* in the Cloud, and in the Sea: *Ergo*, None were baptized with the Spirit since the Apostles Days.

What poor Reasoning is this? Its Absurdity and Weakness is obvious to the meanest Capacity.

There is certainly some Agreement and Resemblance betwixt those two Passages, viz. 1 Cor. x. 12. and xii. 13. But in order to pervert and traduce our Doctrine, this Antagonist would make them really coincident in those

those Parts wherein they are the most conspicuously opposite and incoherent; and designedly conceals that wherein they evidently correspond and coincide.

1. That wherein they are dissimilar is in respect of Duration; the *Israelites* passing through the Sea and under the Cloud was temporary and transient: but the Administration and Dispensation of the Holy Spirit, in the Christian Church, is permanent and perpetual.

2. That wherein they exactly correspond and run parallel is in relation to *Universality*; for as the Apostle in 1 Cor. x. 1, 2. when saying, *were all baptized unto Moses in the Cloud and in the Sea*, doth by the universative ALL, extend to and include all the * then Jewish Church, the whole Host of *Israel*, every Soul indefinitely. So in Chap. xii. 13. of the said Epistle, in saying, *By one Spirit, we are all baptized into one Body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free*; by the same Word ALL, he comprehends every Member of the Church of Christ.

That the Apostle had relation to the *Israelites* in general without Exception, is undeniable; *all our Fathers were under the Cloud, and all passed through the Sea, and were all baptized*, &c. And in as extensive and universal Terms doth he express himself in respect to the Christian Church; 1 Cor. xii. 7, 8, 9. *A Manifestation of the Spirit, saith he, is given to every Man to profit withal; for to one is given by the Spirit the Word of Wisdom; to another the Word of Knowledge by the same Spirit; to another Faith by the same Spirit; to another the Gift of Healing by the same Spirit, &c. And Verse 12. For as the Body is one, and hath many Members, and all the Members of that one Body, being many are one Body, so also is Christ.*

1. The Words, *every Man* in the 7th Verse, must, at least, include every Believer.

2. In the 8th, 9th, 10th and 11th Verses, he enumerates the Diversities of Gifts, and amongst these there are not only those call'd Extraordinary Gifts, such as

When they passed through the Sea and under the Cloud,

were conferr'd on particular Persons for peculiar Services, as working of Miracles, speaking with divers Tongues, &c. but those Ordinary or more common Gifts of the Spirit, wherewith every Christian is endowed, viz. *Wisdom, Knowledge and Faith.*

3. He illustrates the Mystical Body of Christ by an apt Similitude, drawn from the many Members which concur and unite to the constituting an Human Body, inferring, That as the many Members are one Body, so also is Christ respecting his Church or spiritual Body.

As the one Human or Elementary Body comprehends and includes every individual Member, from the least to the greatest thereof; so likewise doth this Mystick or spiritual Body comprehend and include all Believers in general, as the several Members thereunto belonging.

4. He shews in the 13th Verse how and by what Means they became Members of this one Body, viz. *by being baptized by the one Spirit; For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body:* And then as if he cautiously guarded against the Misapplication of the Word *All*, by restricting it to the *Jews*, or those who were free only, he particularizes the several Denominations under which the whole Body of Believers are concluded, saying, *Whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free. And have all drank into one Spirit.* As the one Body, into which they were baptized, is undeniably the Church or spiritual Body; the *All*, who were baptized thereinto, including both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, bond and free, doth necessarily comprehend all and every individual Member that conjunctly constitute that Church. So it is incontestable that the Apostle, in this Text, ascribes the Baptism of the Holy Ghost not only to those who had the Extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit, but also to those who were endow'd with what is call'd the Ordinary Gifts thereof, viz. such as are common to all Believers indefinitely.

The impartial Reader, I think, may easily see that *J. B's* Attempts to disprove and refute our Doctrine, (as grounded on the abovesaid Text relating to the Baptism

Baptism of the Spirit) do turn directly against himself: Nay, the very Words of the Text, without any Comment or Illustration, plainly contradict his Assertion: He denies that the Scripture any where says, That all true Believers are baptized with the Spirit; whereas the Text expressly says, *By one Spirit we are all baptized, &c.*

The Apostle, in this Place, has deliver'd the Matter in Terms so full, explicit and plain, that were there no other Text to be produced, it might be sufficient to prove both the Necessity, Universality and Perpetuity of the spiritual Baptism which we plead for.

But there are many other Scripture Passages evidently concurring herewith, which mutually corroborate the same. The Prophet * *Isaiab*, speaking of the Ministration of the Spirit in the Gospel Times, compares it to the Floods of Water, which has the nearest Relation to Baptism, saying, *I will pour Water upon him that is thirsty, and Floods upon the dry Ground.* And then immediately explains it, *I will pour my Spirit upon thy Seed.* And the Prophet *Ezekiel* says to the same Effect, viz. ** *I will pour clean Water upon you, and ye shall be clean; then presently after, I will put my Spirit within you.* The Prophet *Malachi* is very plain and express in his Prediction relating to the Gospel Dispensation, ¶ *Who, says he, may abide the Day of his Coming, and who shall stand when he appears, for he is like a Refiner's Fire, and a Fuller's Soap, and he shall purify the Sons of Levi, and purge them as Gold and Silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an Offering of Righteousness.* And *Zachariah*, speaking of the Kingdom of Christ, says, *In that Day there shall be a Fountain opened to the House of David, and to the Inhabitants of Jerusalem, for Sin and for Uncleaness,* Zach. xiii. 1.

Upon which I would a little remark as follows,

1. That these Influences and Pourings forth of the Spirit, mention'd or impli'd in these Prophecies, are such as relate to Christians indefinitely, i. e. imply or denote such Measures of the Spirit as are necessary for every Believer to experience in respect of Regeneration.

* *Isaiab* xliv. 3.

** *Ezek.* xxxvi. 35.

¶ *Mal.* iii. 2, 3.

2. That these Expressions or Phrases, viz. *To pour Floods of Water ; to wash or pour clean Water ; to purge and purify ; to set open a Fountain for Sin and Uncleaness, &c.* are synonomous with *to baptize*, and clearly import the Purgation of the Soul by the Baptism of the Spirit.

John the Baptist, speaking of the Operation and Efficacy of the same spiritual Gifts, calls it the *Baptism of the Spirit*, which is taken Notice of by all the four Evangelists, viz. *Mat. iii. 11, 12. Mark i. 7, 8. Luke iii. 16, 17. John i. 33.* The Text in *Luke* says, *As the People were in Expectation, and all Men mused in their Hearts of John, whether he were the Christ or not ; John answered saying unto them all, I indeed baptize you with Water ; but one mightier than I cometh, the Latchet of whose Shoes I am not worthy to unloose : He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire. Whose Fan is in his Hand, and he will thoroughly purge his Floor, and will gather the Wheat into his Garner ; but the Chaff he will burn with Fire unquenchable, Luke iii. 16, 17.*

In this Declaration, made in so publick a manner by the Herald or Forerunner of our Lord, two Particulars do occur, which plainly indicate the Baptism with the Holy Ghost, therein mentioned, to be of a general Tendency.

1. The Multitude to whom he directed his Speech. That the Concourse was very great is evident from these Words, *As the People were in Expectation, and all Men mused in their Hearts of John, whether he was the Christ. John answered saying unto them all, I indeed baptize you with Water—He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, &c.* And as he directed this to the numerous Multitude indefinitely and without Restriction, as is clear from these Words, *Saying unto them all, &c.* it must, according to the common Rules of Construction and the Use of Language, comprehend either every one, or at least the Generality, of them. He delivers this of Christ's spiritually baptizing them, with the same Latitude of Expression, and unlimited Extent, as that of his own having baptized them with Water. *John answered saying unto them*

them all, I baptize you with Water——He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, &c. “ It was, says Bishop Taylor, an Excellency of our blessed Saviour’s Office, that he baptizes all that come to him with the Holy Ghost and with Fire: For so St. John, preferring Christ’s Mission and Office before his own, tells the Jews, not Christ’s Disciples, that Christ shall baptize them with Fire and the Holy Ghost; that is, all that come to him, as John the Baptist did with Water, for so lies the Antithesis.” *Lib. Prop.* p. 231.

2. Having, after the manner of the Hebrews, first propounded the Sum of the Matter, he then explains it at large, saying, *Whose Fan is in his Hand, and he will thoroughly purge his Floor, and will gather his Wheat into his Garner, but the Chaff he will burn up with Fire unquenchable.* These explicative Terms, viz. *Fan in his Hand; thoroughly purging his Floor; gathering the Wheat; burning up the Chaff with Fire unquenchable,* run parallel with the above cited Prediction of the Prophet Malachi.

Here is the Baptism with the Holy Ghost and Fire, answering to the Refiner’s Fire and Fuller’s Soap; and to purge the Floor, and burn the Chaff, answering to purify the Sons of Levi, and purge them as Gold, &c. All which sufficiently set forth the Operation and Efficacy of the spiritual Baptism to be administered in the Gospel Dispensation, viz. That it should cleanse, purge, refine, and purify the Heart; and consequently is requisite and necessary for every Christian to experience: Agreeable whereto I have in my former Book produc’d many Authorities, viz. *Augustine, Chrysostom, Melancthon, Piscator, Pareus, Cornelius à Lapide, Calvin, Erasmus, Peters, Willet, Stephens, Walter Brute, Bishop Taylor, Peter Martyr, Grotius, The Assembly of Divines, Poole, Henry Burkit, &c.* to whose Testimonies I refer the Reader, under the Second Proposition in the above-said Book.

I am at a loss to conjecture what Pretences our Adversaries are able to make, either of Scripture or Reason, in favour of their Notion, viz. That the spiritual

Baptism necessarily implies the Production of miraculous and surprising Effects in the Person baptized therewith, as speaking with unlearned Languages, &c. It is true, J. B. has strenuously asserted it, and frequently denied that any more common or Ordinary Gift of the Spirit is such : But he, as well as the rest, has the Unhappiness to be quite destitute of Proof! He hath not given one Text that says any thing like it. The Passages he brings are *Acts* ii. 4. xi. 15, 16. xix. 6. *Acts* ii. 4. says, *And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other Tongues as the Spirit gave them Utterance.* *Acts* xi. 15, 16. relates to Chap. x. 44—46. viz. *That the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the Word, and that they spake with Tongues, &c.* *Acts* xix. 6. tells us, that when Paul had laid his Hands upon them, *The Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with Tongues and prophesied.* Now, though 'tis allow'd that they who were baptized with the Holy Ghost, as mentioned in those three Places in the *Acts*, spake with other Tongues, yet we have not the least Intimation that it was called Baptism because thereof, or that speaking with other Tongues was to be any certain and infallible Token of spiritual Baptism, or an essential Property of it.

When Christ foretold his Disciples, that *they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many Days hence*, *Acts* i. 5. there is not the least Hint that speaking with other Tongues, or any thing miraculous, should always attend such Baptism as its necessary Consequent, or as an essential Part of the Effect thereof. I say, neither this nor any other Text so much as countenances such an Opinion.

We are told by the Evangelist *Mark*, that our Lord said, these Tokens shall follow them that believe, *In my Name they shall cast out Devils, and shall speak with New Tongues, and shall take up Serpents, &c.* *Mark* xvi. 16, 17.

Would J. B. or his Brother O. Edwards infer from hence, that none are or were Believers but who effected such Miracles? I am sure they may with as much Authority of Scripture and Reason too affirm this, as what they do respecting spiritual Baptism.

Is it not as good *Logick* to say, Because our Saviour said, Those that believe shall cast out Devils, and speak with Tongues : Therefore, None are Believers but they that effect such Miracles ; as it is to say, because we are told, That some who were baptized with the holy Ghost spake with Tongues, &c. Therefore, None are baptized therewith but they on whom such extraordinary Effects are produced.

But as the Conclusion of the *former* is evidently false, so is also that of the *latter*. Nor,

Secondly, Are our Adversaries Notions founded upon any rational Principles, supported by Arguments deduc'd from the Reason and Nature of Things, as the same necessarily relate to the State of the Case ; but their Assertions are merely dogmatical and arbitrary.

The very Import of the Word *Baptism* or *to baptize*, militates strongly against them, in all the various Acceptations thereof ; whether it signifies to dip, plunge, wash, cleanse, purify, &c. as it is in the *Original*, both in the * Sacred Record, and ¶ Classic Authors.

And as βαπτω *to baptize*, is promiscuously used, viz. to dip, plunge, wash, cleanse, purify, &c. in a proper and natural Sense, it may, and frequently is so used in a mystick and metaphorical ; we having no other Mediums or Characters to express the Actions and Passions of the Mind, but the same whereby we do those of the Body.

Whatsoever Gift therefore, or Measure of the Spirit, wherewith any is endowed, may be said to wash or purify, the same may as properly be said to baptize. And whatsoever may be said to be washed or sanctified by the

F 2

Spirit,

* Luke xi. 28. πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη, that he did not first wash Mark vii. 4. ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωμαι, except they wash. βαπτισμὸς ποτηρίων, the Washing of Cups. Mark vii. 8. βαπτισμὸς ἑστῶν καὶ ποτηρίων, the Washing of Pots and Cups.

¶ Hesychius, Stephanus, Scapula, &c. Masters of the Greek Tongue, give many Instances out of Classic Authors to prove that βαπτω is indifferently taken to denote Washing, Dipping, Cleansing, Purgings, &c.

Spirit, the same may, with as much Propriety of Speech, be said to be baptized therewith.

What Affinity or Relation has Baptism or Washing, according to common Acceptation, either in a proper or figurative Sense, with producing of Miracles or surprising Effects, as *J. B.* and his Brother **O. Edwards* would have it? When a Person or Thing is said to be dipt or washed corporally, must, or doth that necessarily imply that some Miracle or surprising Effect was produc'd thereby.

As Baptism, Dipping, or Washing, in a proper and natural Sense, by common Use of Speech, imports no more than an Absterfion or Purgation of common and ordinary corporal Pollution and Defilement, neither doth the same Phrase or Term in a Figurative or spiritual Sense denote or signify the Production of any miraculous or surprising Effect; but only a Purgation and Purification from that spiritual Pollution and Uncleaness, unto which we are, as it were, naturally incident, and wherewith Mankind are generally defiled in a State of Degeneration.

And this is remarkably verified in those two Passages in the *Acts*, viz. Chap. ii. and x. The Effusion and Influence of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles on the Day of *Pentecost*, wrought a wonderful Change in their intellectual State and Frame of Mind, which is elegantly set forth in the Quotation from Dr. *Adam's* in p. 21, 22. foregoing, whereunto I refer the Reader; and no less an Alteration was effected in those at the House of *Cornelius*, Acts x. by the Influence of the Holy Ghost under the Ministry of the Apostle *Peter*: There was an effectual Work of Sanctification experienc'd on them; they were

* *Oswald Edwards*, in his second Strok, p. 60, asserts, That those Measures of the Spirit, whereby Men are converted, sanctified, &c. are not the Baptism of the Spirit, but those Extraordinary Measures of the Holy Ghost, poured out in a marvellous manner upon the Apostles in the Days of *Pentecost*; and challenges any to prove the contrary, tho' at the same Time his own Assertion is void of Proof, and merely dogmatical.

were no doubt washed and cleansed from many Spots and Stains of Sin, and their Understandings freed from much Blindness, Error and Ignorance, which they had contracted whilst under the Power of *Gentilism*.

In this Sense were they baptized with the Holy Ghost; and 'tis in all respects most consistent to conclude, that it was call'd *Baptism*, because of the sanctifying Efficacy and spiritual Purgation thereby produced in their Minds.

J. B. and his Brethren strenuously insist upon the native Signification of the Word *Baptism*, and severely censure those who dogmatically and magisterially force and wrest the Word to a remote and foreign Interpretation in favour of the Practice of Sprinkling, and to intitle human Tradition to the Honour of a Sacred Canon. But how will J. B. and his Brother O. E. escape their own Censure, in dogmatically and arbitrarily forcing the same Word or Term, when spiritually applied, to the most foreign and remote Signification imaginable, viz. that it necessarily implies the Production of miraculous Effects? What to condemn and blame others for that which they themselves are extremely guilty of! *Turpe est Doctori cum culpa redarguit ipsum.*

J. B. defines external Baptism to be a total Immersion or dipping of the whole Body into Water. Now, if he allows such an Elementary Administration to be outward Baptism, he must of consequence allow that such an Administration of the Spirit is inward Baptism.

That he allows, nay maintains, that such an Administration of the Spirit is attainable and necessary to be experienc'd by Believers, is plain from his own Words.

Pag. 43, 44. " If the Efficacy of Christ's Blood,
 " says he, does not effect all the Powers and Faculties
 " of the Soul, then is there no Judgment to be made
 " of the Account which we have of spiritual Washing
 " in the Scriptures; of being cleansed from all Filthiness,
 " &c. Ezek. xxxvi. 25. Psal. li. 2. Wash me thorough-
 " ly from mine Iniquity, and cleanse me from my Sin.
 " So vers. 7. Purge me with Hyssop, and I shall be clean:

Wash

“ *Wash me, and I shall be whiter than Snow.* David
 “ here (I judge) looks to the Blood of Jesus for clean-
 “ sing his stained and leprous Soul, as typified by the
 “ Blood sprinkled with Hyssop, &c. (*Levit. 14. 6. 8.*)
 “ which was the Law for purging the Leper, whose
 “ Clothes and Body also were to be washed in *Water*,
 “ to perfect his Cleansing : And therefore the *Psal-*
 “ *mist* says, *Wash me, and I shall be whiter than Snow.*
 “ In *Ezek. xvi. 9.* we read, *Then washed I thee with*
 “ *Water ; yea, I thoroughly washed away thy Blood from*
 “ *thee.* And in *John xiii. 10.* our blessed Lord tells
 “ the Apostle *Peter*, *He that is washed is clean every*
 “ *whit.*

“ Now, Sir, as the Cleansing which is effected by
 “ the Blood of Jesus (called the Blood of Sprinkling)
 “ is a throughout Sanctification ; certainly then the
 “ Sprinkling of Water, on the Head or Face only,
 “ can never serve to represent it : For the Efficacy of
 “ the Blood of Sprinkling extendeth to, or is diffused
 “ over the whole Soul, to the Sanctification of all the
 “ Powers or Faculties thereof. ——— The Apostle
 “ *Paul*, when he treats of the Sanctification of the
 “ Church of Christ, represents it as being freed from
 “ all Defilements and Deformity ; or as being deli-
 “ vered from every Spot or Wrinkle, or any such
 “ Thing, *Eph. v. 26, 27.*” And in his *Supple-*
 “ *ment*, pag. 98. “ I shall not, *says he*, shun to de-
 “ clare that I am firmly of Opinion, that unless we
 “ are born of the Spirit, there can be no good Ground
 “ to fix our Hope of eternal Salvation upon. *Ibid.* pag.
 “ 100. I am perswaded that none of the fallen Race
 “ of *Adam* were ever admitted to the undefiled and
 “ blisful Regions of Heaven, in an unregenerate
 “ State.”

From these our *Opponents* own Expressions it is un-
 deniably evident, that he maintains, and cites * several
 Texts

* *Ezek. xxxvi. 5. Psal. li. 2. John xiii. 10. Rev. i, 5. Eph.*
v. 26. 1 John i. 7.

Texts to prove that such an Administration of the Spirit is attainable, and necessary to be experienced by Believers, as fully implies a total Immersion of the Soul therein.

To be thoroughly washed from Iniquity, and cleansed from all Sin — purged as with Hyssop — made whiter than Snow — washed clean every whit — free'd from all Defilements and Deformity; and delivered from every Spot or Wrinkle of Sin — to have the Blood of Sprinkling extended to, and diffused over the whole Soul, to the Sanctification of all the Powers and Faculties thereof; doth necessarily imply a total Immersion of the Soul; or Dipping of the whole Inward Man in the Laver of Regeneration or Sprinkling, that cleansed from all Sin; the which is Spiritual Baptism; in as large a Latitude and extensive Sense as ever we pretended to maintain.

This one Passage of *J. B's.* contained in the preceding Quotation, pag. 43, 44. delivered by him when treating of Sanctification, is a plain Proof of the Continuance of spiritual Baptism, and might sufficiently frustrate all his Attempts to the contrary.

To render *J. B's.* Self Contradiction, relating to this Point of Doctrine, a little more obvious to the Reader, let us collate his Assertions in pag. 43, 44 and 98. with those in pag. 110. 111. as follows,

“ If the Efficacy of ——— We must there-
 “ Christ's Blood does not — fore conclude that the
 “ affect all the Powers — Text (i. e. 1 Cor. xii.
 “ and Faculties of the — 13.) doth not, nor was
 “ Soul, then is there no — design'd to prove, that
 “ Judgment to be made — the spiritual Baptism
 “ of the Account which — was to continue; nei-
 “ we have of spiritual — ther, says he, do I
 “ Washings in the Scrip- — know any good Rea-
 “ tures. — For the — son to suppose, that
 “ Efficacy of the Blood — there is any Christian
 “ of Sprinkling extendeth — Baptism now in Being,
 “ to “ but

“ to, and is diffused over
 “ the whole Soul, to the
 “ Sanctification of all the
 “ Powers and Faculties
 “ thereof; ——— I am
 “ firmly of Opinion, that
 “ unless we are born of
 “ the Spirit, there can be
 “ no good Ground to fix
 “ our Hope of eternal Sal-
 “ vation upon.”

“ but that of Water,
 “ which according to the
 “ Commission, is to con-
 “ tinue with the Gospel to
 “ the End of the World.”

'Tis true, the Words, spiritual Baptism, are not
 literally express'd; but that his Terms do as naturally
 and necessarily imply it, as the Term *Day* doth *Light*,
 is beyond Contradiction.

What Words can more fully and clearly comprehend
 spiritual Baptism, than spiritual Washing, a total Immer-
 sion, &c. an entire Purgation of the Soul in and by
 the Spirit of Holiness?

And for its Continuance, or Perpetuity, he is as full
 and clear, “ I am firmly of Opinion, *says he*, that un-
 “ less we be born of the Spirit, &c. ——— And yet on
 the other Side, he flatly denies that there is any such
 Thing in Being! What strange Confusion and Incon-
 sistence!

And as confused and incoherent with himself is O. E.
 He denies the Continuance of spiritual Baptism. —
 But then in his Definition thereof, he fairly and fully
 includes it in the Work of Sanctification, the which
 he holds necessary for all Believers: A most palpable
 self Contradiction! And truly I do not much wonder
 that our Adversaries are so confused and bewildred in
 their Undertakings. Can we reasonably expect they
 should have any better Success in opposing such a self-
 evident Principle and essential Part of Christianity, as
 the Baptism of the Spirit, which effects that upon the
 Soul that Fire doth upon Metals, and Water upon
 elementary Bodies, *viz*, consuming the Dross, refining,
 cleansing,

cleansing, purifying, &c. and therefore significantly called, by some, the *Sine quâ Non*, i. e. without which there is no Salvation.

“ Neither, *says he*, do I know any good Reason to suppose that there is any Christian Baptism now in Being, but that of Water.” Certainly if *J. B.* has experienced, in himself, what he talks of, pag. 43. *viz. to be spiritually washed, to the Sanctification of all the Powers and Faculties of the Soul*, he would have been so far from having no Reason, that he would have had the very best Reason, the strongest and most powerful Motive, not only to suppose, but to believe, that there is no other Christian Baptism, but that of the Spirit. But I am jealous that his Denial of it, arises from his Want of Experience thereof.

Pag. 107. “ I think it necessary, that those who believe that the Baptism of the Spirit was to be continued to the future Ages of Christianity, do produce some Texts of Scripture to prove it; or by the same Authority prove, that Conversion is this Baptism, and then we will not contest this Part of the Dispute any longer. Or, else let them evince to us, by the like evident Effects, which the spiritual Baptism was attended with, *viz. speaking and prophesying in all Languages at the same Time, &c.* and then I shall not scruple to believe, that the spiritual Baptism is still in Being. But until it is proved from Scripture or Experience, I do not see any Reason to suppose that it is continued to these latter Ages of Christianity, or that it has been experienced since the Apostles Days.”

Answer, I think I have sufficiently proved the Continuance, as well as Necessity and Essentiality, of spiritual Baptism; and that Conversion, Regeneration, and this Baptism are synonymously spoke of, so as the One implies the Other. *viz.*

1. From *Ti. iii. 35. Acts ii. 38.* compared with *Acts iii. 9.*

2. From Christ's Discourse with *Nicodemus.* John iii. 3. 5.

3. From the Testimony of the Apostle *Paul*, 1 Cor. xii. 13.

4. By the predictive Declaration of *John* the Baptist in *Matt.* iii. 11. *Mark* i. 7. 8. *Luke* iii. 16, 17. *John* i. 33.

5. From the Etymology and Acceptation of the Phrase *to baptize*.

6. By *J. B's* own Concessions and plain Assertions, where he maintains the Necessity of spiritual Washing, which is synonymous with, and equivalent to, spiritual Baptism.

7. That our *Opponent's* holding that the Baptism of the Spirit necessarily implies the Producing miraculous Effects operates against himself, and renders his Assertions manifestly contradictory to each other in several Particulars; and his insisting thereon is absurd and inconsistent with the Reason and Nature of Things. It was not call'd the Baptism of the Spirit in those Places of the *Acts*, because the Persons baptized therewith, spoke with other Tongues and prophesied: But in respect to the eminent Change and Conversion, both in a moral and religious Capacity, it produced in them by its cleansing, purifying, and regenerating Efficacy and Operation.

8. Be it observed, that *J. B's* Opposition, in this Point of Doctrine, is not against the People called *Quakers* only, but those of other Perswasions in general, viz. *Romanists*, *Episcopalians*, *Presbyterians*, and his Brethren the *Baptists*, as I have shewn in my former Book, by Quotations from approv'd Writers of each Community, who unanimously hold that the Baptism of the Spirit is continued as necessarily connected with real Christianity, and effectually productive of the same. And considering it as such, it is a strong and cogent Argument, that the same is the very Baptism intended in the Commission *Matt.* xxviii. 19. especially since there is but one essential Baptism in the Christian Church.

I have

I have been the more copious on this Head, because my *Antagonist* has insisted upon it with Prolixity, as a decisive Argument in the Controversy; concluding, with some others of our Adversaries, that if he can disprove the Existence of spiritual Baptism, the Baptism that is to continue must be the Elementary. He therefore labours hard to excite and fix such a Notion in his Readers; so I have taken the more pains to examine all his Allegations, and endeavour'd to shew him the Invalidity, Unsoundness and Inconsistency of his Reasoning, in Order for his Conviction, as well as Refutation.

S E C T. II.

J B's next Step is about the Practice of the Apostles, pag. 111. "First, says he, as that the Apostles and primitive Administrators of Baptism, never once mention their Baptism with the Spirit when they administered this sacred Ordinance.

Ans. Will he say they never once mention such a Thing, when the Apostle *Peter* is so plain about the matter, relating to what himself did at the House of *Cornelius*? Is it not very apparent from *Acts* x. 44. and xi. 15. that they received the Gift of the Holy Ghost by the Apostle's Ministry, and that it was the Baptism of the Spirit is clear from what the Apostle himself says, *Acts* ix. 16. and from what *J. B.* frequently confesses, pag. 107. 109, 110.

And it is very plain from *Acts* viii. 14, 15, 16, 17, 18—ix. 17—xix. 5, 6. that *Peter*, *John*, *Ananias*, and *Paul*, instrumentally administered the spiritual Baptism. See from pag. 74. to 91. inclusive, and pag. 166, 167. in my Answer to *P. Bedingfield*, where this Point is fully discussed, and fairly proved, that it is as consistent

with Scripture, Reason and the Nature of Things to say, that the Apostles baptized with the Holy Ghost, as to say they raised the Dead, healed the Sick, &c. And if *J. B.* is of a contrary Opinion, as he appears to be, Why did he not examine and refute the Arguments there contained.

But it seems he thought it most convenient to give it, and *R. Barclay's* too, quite the Go-by in Silence, as well as he has the other Parts; as if nothing had been said. What trifling Doing is this? Since he had so very little to say in Opposition to *R. Barclay's* Arguments and mine; it was no better than a Piece of Vanity to pretend to answer either of us, much more both.

Let *J. B.* in his next (if he believes that the Apostles raised the Dead, &c. and yet denies that they baptized with the Spirit) directly answer these Arguments in the Pages above cited, and give sufficient Reason why he holds a Contrariety of Judgment in two Cases so parallel and of equal Verity, as plainly demonstrating from Scripture, Reason, and the Nature of Things, why it may not be instrumentally as predicable of Men in One as the Other.

Ibid. pag. 111. " But that of Water is more than
 " once expressly named. The Text, *Acts* x. 47. is so
 " ample a Proof hereof, that the Authors who have
 " wrote against Water-baptism, do either wholly neg-
 " lect to take any Notice of it, or else they extremely
 " boggle at it, and treat it in a very unjust Manner;
 " * pretending to represent the Apostle *Peter* here as
 " hesitating about the Baptizing these believing *Gentiles*,
 " and only inquiring if it was necessary to admin-
 " ister Baptism to them, when the Text carries as full
 " and plain a Proof of *Peter's* being entirely satisfied
 " that these Persons ought to be baptized, as can by
 " Words be expressed; Who is so far from asking
 " Advice, whether the Thing ought to be done (as this
 " ** Author supposeth) that he gives a Challenge to all
 " Men,

“ Men, to attempt the Forbidding of it, or in o-
 “ ther Words, to shew him a Reason against their
 “ being baptized, saying, *Can any Man forbid Water,*
 “ &c.”

Answ. I very much question whether he can name One of the Writers against Water-baptism, that wholly neglects to take any Notice of *Acts* x. 47. Tho’ he asserts it in such general Terms. Dr. *Dell*, of *Cambridge*, I think, does not mention it in Particular; but it is included in his *Answer* to the *Objection* concerning the Apostle’s using Water baptism.

As for any of the People called *Quakers*, I am much mistaken if he can name One of them who has wrote, *ex Professo*, on the Subject, that has not taken particular Notice of it. Why did he not inform his Reader who these Authors are, that have pass’d it without any Notice? If he scorns to quote, one would think, he might easily have referr’d to the Pages, that the Reader might have seen for himself; and not take all upon *J. B.’s ipse dixit*.

“ He (*i. e.* the Apostle) gives a Challenge to all
 “ Men to attempt the Forbidding of it.” This is extraordinary! Who would ever imagine that any would have supposed such a Thing? Can he produce any Text, relating to the Practice of the Apostles, that gives any Countenance to such an Assertion? No, it was not the Manner of the Apostles to exhibit Challenges to any Man, much less to all Men. I am therefore induced to think that *J. B.* has misrepresented and perverted the Apostle’s Meaning. It seems very clear that the Apostle was so far from giving a Challenge to all Men, that he only modestly proposed the Question, to understand whether they of the Circumcision, who accompanied him, were satisfied or not; and if they had made any Objection against their being baptized, would very probably, knowing it to be an indifferent Thing, have forborn it.

Ibid. pag. 112. “ He commanded them to be baptiz-
 “ ed in the Name of the Lord; which I understand to
 “ be by the Authority of the Lord Jesus.”

Answ.

Ans. His commanding them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord, and not in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and Holy Ghost, very plainly shews he acted not in Conformity to the Commission, *Matt. xxviii.* and consequently understood it not to relate to Water-baptism; or to be observed as an Institution for administering that Ceremony. That their being commanded to be baptized in the Name of the Lord, implies that the Action was done by Christ's Authority, or perform'd in Obedience to his Command, *Matt. xxviii. 19.* is a plain Contradiction to the very Words of the Commission, supposing it to be a Precept of Water-baptism.

J. B's. Brother, O. Edwards, in his second *Stroke*, pag. 47. holds, that it was the Custom of *John* to baptize in the Name of the Lord Jesus. And brings for Proof *Dr. Duveel* on *Acts xix. 5.* quoting *Gregory of Neocesarea* in *Pontus*, on *Matt. iii. 14.* The Bishop represents *John* thus, *While I baptize others, I baptize them in thy Name, that they may believe in thee coming with Glory. But when I baptize thee, whom shall I mention? In whose Name shall I baptize thee?* And *Ambrosius, Tertullian, Calvin, Dr. Willet, Fulk, &c.* hold the very same: So that *Peter's* omitting these Words, in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, expressed in Christ's Commission when he commanded them to be baptized; but instead thereof using the Words which *John* did, apparently enough indicates, that his so bidding them, had no Relation to *Matt. xxviii. 19.* (nay, that he thereby cautiously guarded against such a Supposition) but only to the Baptism of *John*, which was in Practice long after, as appears in *Acts xix.* Tho' it ceased in Respect to Obligation with the Ceremonies of the Law, the End of that Baptism being to discover Christ to the Jews in his personal Ministry, as *John* himself declares, that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with Water. *John i. 31.*

Ibid. " But if *St. Peter* had any Hesitation or Scruple about Water-baptism being intended in the Commission, I desire to know whether it would not be looked upon as an high Presumption in him to com-

" mand

“mand these Persons to be baptized in the Name of the Lord?”

Answ. I should have thought it much more agreeable to Reason and Scripture too, if *Peter* had believed that Water-baptism was intended in the Commission; that *J. B.* should have rather desired to know whether it would not be looked upon as an high Presumption in him, or any else, to command them to be baptized in any other Name, or Form of Words, but what is expressed in the said Commission.——But 'tis a small Fault with *J. B.* to state his Questions in a Way quite contrary to what Truth and Reason would direct: Were he not so much byass'd with Prejudice and powerless Formality, he might easily see, that if *Peter* had understood the Commission to intend Water-baptism, he would not by any Means have deviated the least Jot from the very Words thereof. Nay, to suppose otherwise, would represent the Apostle, according to *J. B.*'s Position, to be guilty of high Presumption.

This is not only *Argumentum ad Hominem*, but in it self unanswerable by our Opponents, who unanimously hold, that to express the Names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the Administration of Water-baptism is an essential Part; and would pronounce them *Hereticks* who would presume to deviate therefrom by leaving out any of those Names, as I have shewn in my aforesaid Book. I never pretended that *Peter* hesitated or scrupled whether Water-baptism was intended in *Matt. xxviii. 19.* I always thought he well knew that it was not.

Ibid. “Who will presume to say, That the inspired Apostles did dare to do any thing, or command any thing to be done, in the Name of the Lord, which they hesitated about, or had not his special Warrant for?”

Answ. This Question shews as if he was not much acquainted with the New-Testament Writings, or else has but a treacherous Memory. Did not the Apostle *James* direct the Believers, if any were Sick among them, to call the Elders of the Church, and let them pray over him,

him, anointing him with Oil in the Name of the Lord, James v. 14. And yet anointing the Sick with Oil, tho' perform'd in the Name of the Lord, has been so much hesitated about, as to be quite laid aside, by all *protestant* Churches at least, so far as I know: There being no Command or special Warrant from Christ for the Observation thereof; it was certainly an indifferent Thing, even in the Days of the Apostles, and might very reasonably be then, and no doubt was, hesitated about; for whatever is indifferent the same is hesitable. Therefore an indifferent Thing, or what may be hesitated about, as not having a special Warrant for the Doing of it, may be perform'd, in the Name of the Lord, without the Imputation of Presumption; or affording any Manner of Occasion for surprize, as * *J. B.* asserts. So might *Peter's* commanding *Cornelius* to be baptized in the Name of the Lord, be an indifferent Thing, and consequently might very reasonably require Hesitation.

Ibid. pag. 112, 113. "I am surprized to find our
 " Author so trifling in an Affair of such Moment, and
 " that he will attempt to obscure the shining Light of
 " this plain Text, which as evidently proves, that the
 " Apostle had no Scruple about the Lawfulness of Bap-
 " tism, but expresses his real Satisfaction of the Validity
 " of his Ordinance, as if it had been written with a
 " Sun-Beam."

Answ. If I was so very trifling in the Affair, 'tis strange he neglected to make it appear. Must his bare Assertions pass for Demonstration? He has not quoted a Line, either from *Barclay* or *Me*, and yet he makes no scruple to tell his Reader in his *Title Page*, that he has answer'd our Arguments particularly! Who is really the

Trifler

* He must either allow, contrary to his own Assertion, that an indifferent Thing, or what has not Christ's special Warrant for the doing of it, may be done in the Name of the Lord, without the imputation of Presumption; or else shew Christ's special Warrant for anointing the Sick with Oil under the Gospel Dispensation; otherwise he makes the Apostle *James* guilty of Presumption, &c

Trifler, will, I question not, appear plain to the Judicious, if he would but compare Book with Book, i. e. *Barclay's* 12th Proposition, and my *Answer to Bedingfield*, with *J. B's*. pretended Answer to both of us.

“ That this Text as evidently proves that the Apostle
 “ express'd his real Satisfaction about the Validity of
 “ Water-baptism, as if it had been written with a Sun-
 “ Beam.” It is but an empty Flourish to amuse the
 unwary Reader, and to supply the Defect of Argument.
 His great Unhappiness is, he still forgets to prove what
 he affirms.

To convince the Reader whether I have trifled in
 what I advanced about this Text; and how defective
J. B. is in his *Examination* thereof; I shall insert some
 of the most material Passages, viz.

“ As touching *Cornelius's* being baptized, 'tis to be
 “ considered, that he, being a devout Man, of good
 “ Report among all the Nation of the *Jews*, could not
 “ well be ignorant of the Ministration of *John*, to
 “ which the Generality of the *Jews* at first, to whom
 “ it properly belonged, and many *Jewish* Converts
 “ since, had in Reference thereto submitted, might very
 “ probably request that the same might be administred
 “ to him and his Fellow-Converts: Whoever became
 “ a Convert, says *this Author*, immediately requested
 “ Baptism; and *Peter*, not willing to disappoint such
 “ a Request and Expectation,——But well knowing
 “ that Water-baptism was *John's* Ministration, and
 “ related more particularly to the *Jews* (according to
 “ *John* i. 29, 31.) and this being the first Instance of
 “ *Gentile* Conversion to Christianity, might well doubt
 “ whether it might be applied to the *Gentile* Converts;
 “ he therefore puts the Question to the *Jewish* Brethren
 “ who came with him, saying, *Can any Man forbid*
 “ *Water*, that these should not be baptized, which have
 “ received the Holy Ghost, as well as we? And they
 “ either expressly or tacitly signifying their Consent,

“ he commanded * them *to be baptized in the Name of the Lord.*

“ Now, one would think his asking the Question, “ *Can any Man forbid, &c.* which was evidently appealing to the Judgment of Men, respecting the Fitness and Unfitness of the Action, plainly enough shews, it was not the Baptism enjoyn’d by Christ’s Commission, *Matt. xxviii.* For, observe, when the Apostle was fully convinc’d by the Vision, and *Cornelius’s* Declaration, that the *Gentiles* were the Subjects of the Gospel, he made not any Hesitation, by what appears, or in the least consulted or appealed unto any, whether he might preach the Gospel unto them. But when *Cornelius* had done speaking, the Text says, *then Peter opened his Mouth and said, Of a Truth, &c.* He did not first query whether any Man could forbid preaching, that these should not have the glad Tidings of Salvation published to them, since it was apparent that they were the Subjects thereof, as well as the *Jews*; No such thing: He well knew this was not a Matter to be subjected to the Judgment or Determination of Men, nor was there any need of appealing to have their Sentiments concerning it, (tho’ this was the principal and most material Point) as being sensible that it was his indispensable Duty, and that no Man either ought or could forbid it.

“ And had he understood Water-baptism to have been that express’d in the Commission *to preach the Gospel*, *Mat. xxviii.* he would not, undoubtedly, have made any more Hesitation, or asking of Questions about the administering the one than the other, seeing his Authority would have been equally indisputable, and his Duty indispensable in both.

“ But inasmuch as the Apostle, when once he perceiv’d that these *Gentiles* were the Subjects of the new Covenant, did not at all hesitate, ask or wait for “ any

* *Cornelius* and his Company.

“ any Man’s Consent or Approbation for the Perfor-
 “ mance of the one, but did for the other ; we cannot
 “ but conclude, that these two Actions, viz. His
 “ Preaching the Gospel to them, and his commanding
 “ them to be baptized with Water, proceeded from
 “ two different Motives.

“ And why *Peter’s* thus commanding those *Gentiles*
 “ to be baptized with Water, after they had receiv’d
 “ the Baptism of the Spirit, should any more infer the
 “ Necessity of Water-baptism, than his compelling
 “ (which was more than commanding) the *Gentiles* to
 “ live as did the *Jews*, Gal. xi. 14. after the Abroga-
 “ tion of the Law, and Commencement of the Gospel
 “ Dispensation, infers the Necessity of observing *Jewish*
 “ Rites and Ceremonies, has not yet been demonstrated ;
 “ nor has this Author at all attempted it, though it
 “ was certainly incumbent upon him.

“ And what doth he talk of their being baptized
 “ with Water into the Christian Profession, when it is
 “ undeniable, that they were not only in the Profession,
 “ but also in the Possession of Christianity, before they
 “ receiv’d Water-baptism.

“ Doth he imagine they were so plentifully filled with
 “ the Holy Ghost (the blessed Comforter which Christ
 “ told his Disciples *should guide them into all Truth, and*
 “ *bring all Things to their Remembrance*) as to speak with
 “ Tongues, magnify, &c. and yet all the while desti-
 “ tute of the Christian Profession, incapable, or not
 “ qualified to profess Christ until they receiv’d the
 “ Elementary Water ? An empty, weak Notion, and
 “ fit to be exploded the Christian World.”

“ All this, and more too, touching this Passage of
 “ *Acts* x. 47. *of B.* was pleased to evade, and that excel-
 “ lent Reasoning of *R. Barclay’s* on the same Text, *Apol.*
 “ pag. 438, 439. without taking any Notice of it at all.
 “ Both which are now directed to *J. B.* for him fairly to
 “ examine and refute in his next.

“ Pag. 113. “ *Secondly*, says he, The Baptism admi-
 “ nistred by *Philip* to the Eunuch, is allow’d by our
 “ Opponents

“ Opponents to be that of Water : Yet this they tell us
 “ was *John's* Baptism. But the Argument to support
 “ this Opinion is built upon a very slender Basis ; as
 “ supposing that *Philip* was very cool and indifferent a-
 “ bout answering the Eunuch's Question, by putting
 “ his Answer in the permissive Form, viz. *If thou be-
 “ lievest, thou mayst*, Acts viii. 37. I profess I cannot
 “ imagine what *Philip* could have said more to the Pur-
 “ pose. ———”

Ans. I do not apprehend why he should be so pre-
 posterous as to place it after that of *Cornelius's*, seeing
 it stands before this, both in the *Acts* and my *Book*.
 How could he expect the Reader should duly examine
 the Books, when he has plac'd the Matter so disorderly.

Though I gave two other Reasons to shew that this
 was the Baptism of *John*, yet he has wholly passed over
 them, and given but Part of this Third ; all which I
 must desire him to answer in his next.

“ I profess, *says he*, I cannot imagine what *Philip*
 “ could have said more, &c.” ——— I freely grant that
Philip spoke directly to the Purpose, and very per-
 tinent to the Question, considering it was *John's*
 Baptism ; but if *J. B.* will have it to be in pursuance of
Mat. xxviii. 19. he could, and certainly would have
 said more to the Purpose, and more pertinent to the
 Question. The Commission makes *Baptizing* as inde-
 spensable a Duty as *Preaching* ; and *Baptism* as essential
 for Salvation as *Faith*, Mark xvi. 16. John iii. 5. Can
 it therefore reasonably be supposed, that *Philip*, who
 was sent in such an extraordinary manner, whose Mini-
 stry was intirely for the Salvation of the Party to whom
 he was sent, should have seemed so very cool and indif-
 ferent about such an essential Part of Religion, as to say,
Thou mayst ; and that only in answer to what the Party
 required ? What could have been more indifferently
 spoken, to permit any Thing to be done which we value
 not whether it be done or not ? We have all the reason
 imaginable to conclude, that if *Philip* had understood
 the Commission, *Mat.* xxviii. 19. to relate to Water-
 baptism,

baptism, that he would, instead of answering *thou mayst*, have said *thou must*, and would have told him in earnest, that *Baptism* was as necessary as *Faith*; that he must be baptized as well as believe, if he would be a Christian, and expected Salvation? And, *Secondly*, would have strictly observed the very Words of the Commission, baptizing him in the Name of the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*.

As to the *First*, the Text is express in the Negative: With respect to the *latter*, his Practice at *Samaria*, a little before, viz. *baptizing in the Name of the Lord Jesus*, argues against it; and is a sufficient Motive to believe that he baptized the Eunuch in the same Name; so that there's nothing inferable hence in favour of Water-baptism, nor so much as suggested that it was performed in Obedience to *Mat. xxviii. 19.* or that it was any other than the Baptism of *John*.

What *J. B.* says in his two next Periods rather confirms than disproves what I asserted to shew, that it was only *John's* Baptism. In the *first* he makes *Faith* a necessary Qualification for the Baptism the Eunuch desired to be administred; and so it was for that of *John's*. His *second* says, "Certainly when a Man is convinced that an Ordinance is his great Privilege as well as Duty to come under it;" In this Part of the Sentence he would insinuate as if *Philip* had labour'd to convince the Eunuch that Water-baptism was an Ordinance of the Gospel, and inform'd him that it was his great Privilege as well as Duty to submit to it, &c. Whereas we have not the least Intimation that *Philip* so much as mentioned Water-baptism to him, or that the Eunuch's Question sprung from any Motion in *Philip*; but purely from himself, arising most probably from a preconceiv'd Opinion he had of *John's* Baptism as being a *Jewish* Proselyte.

But then in the subsequent Part of this Period he spoils it all again, by making it a Matter of mere Indifference. "It is enough, says he, to inform him that he is permitted to partake thereof, or pass under it."

Thus

Thus he confirms what we hold, by making it a thing of mere Permission and not of Injunction.

Page 114. "Farther, this Author, in order to obtain an Advantage against Water-baptism, hath made a very unjust Concession to his Antagonist, in allowing that Water-baptism was practised under the Law as a Jewish Rite to initiate their Profelytes.

Answ. That I have made such a Concession is very true; but that it is an unjust one, is more than he can, or, at least has proved. There is one Thing remarkable in this Assertion of *J. B's*, as well as many of the rest, viz. That he contradicts the other Assertors of Water-baptism, who hold that it was a Jewish Rite. How confuted are these Maintainers of this Ceremony? What one Party affirms, another denies! How shall their Cause stand, when they know not where to fix it?

J. B's Predecessors in the Defence of Water-baptism, in order to gain an Advantage in Support of it, held, that it was a Rite in practice among the Jews under the Law; but he himself rejects that as a very unjust Opinion, and which gives an Advantage against it. Does not this suggest that he holds these, viz. *Ainsworth, Dr. Hammond, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dean, Ecclard, Diodate, Poole, &c.* to have been erroneous, and miserably mistaken, as taking that for a Support which is really destructive to his and their Cause? Besides, Can *J. B.* justly blame me, or any else, in granting an Assertion or Concession of an Antagonist to take the Advantage in Point of Argument?

Ibid. "For the Proof of which he has produced several Authors, who wrote many Hundred Years too late for the proving of any such Rite among the Jews before *John the Baptist's* Time."

Answ. For this as he has not offer'd any Evidence farther than his *ipse dixit*, so there needs no other Reply but to call upon him for Proof of his Assertion.

Ibid. "But if human Authority, and doubtful Authors, are esteemed of such Importance with this Writer, &c. as to out weigh the Testimony of sa-

“ cred Scripture, in his Account; yet, I hope, he
 “ will excuse me if I reject all Opinions that appear
 “ dissonant to the invaluable Records of the *Bible*.”

Ans. The first Part of this Clause represents me to
 prefer human Authority to the Testimony of Scripture,
 the which I deny; and to the other Part I am so very
 ready to excuse him, if he rejects all Opinions that ap-
 pear dissonant to the *Bible*, that I advise him so to do;
 which if he had done, he had certainly saved both him-
 self and me the Trouble of this Controversy.

The principal Motive of this Reply is from an Ap-
 prehension that he has preferred human Authority, the
 Conceptions and Traditions of Men, to the plain Testi-
 mony of Holy Writ.

Page 115. “ When he, *i. e.* *John*, told them, *i. e.*
 “ the *Priests* and *Levites*, that he was not *Christ*, (and
 “ through a Mistake) nor *Elias*, for they immediately
 “ query, *Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that*
 “ *Christ* nor *Elias*? This Question very naturally im-
 “ plies, that Baptism was not then in practice among
 “ the *Jews*, as some Authors would perswade their
 “ Readers to believe.”

J. B. charges *John* here with being guilty of a Mi-
 stake in telling them he was not *Elias*; but the Mistake
 is in *J. B.* himself, in misunderstanding these *Priests* and
Levites Question and *John*’s Answer. The *Jews* had a
 Notion, through a Mistake of the Words of the Pro-
 phet *Malachi*, iv. 5. that *Elijah* the Prophet, who was
 taken up to Heaven in a fiery Chariot, should personally
 come again before the Coming of *Christ*; therefore their
 Question was, whether he was properly and personally
Elias or *Elijah*? And he, answering in the same Sense in
 which they design’d it, said, *I am not*.

Had they asked the Question in the same Sense in
 which the Prophet *Malachi* intended, that is, with re-
 spect not to Identity of Persons, but to the Similitude of
 Gifts, Power and Authority, wherein *John* did truly
 represent the said *Elias* or *Elijah*, he would not have
 answered negatively. For it would be absurd to suppose
 that

that *John*, under his Endowments, should be so grossly ignorant of the Prophet's Meaning, and of his own Ministry, as to be guilty of such an Error : 'Tis much more safe to hold, that the Mistake was on the *Jews* side, who were then in a State of Degeneracy, than to charge the same upon *John* the Baptist, as *J. B.* has done : Who would have thought that any Person, advocating the Cause of Water-baptism, would have discover'd so much Error, as to represent the degenerate and superstitious *Pharisees* more sound and orthodox, touching divine Mysteries, or the Interpretation of the Prophecy, than *John* who was so great a Prophet himself, and said to be filled with the Holy Ghost from his Birth ; nay, it sets forth that their Notion was entirely right, and *John's* quite wrong.

" But, says he, the Baptist was the Prophet, yea, " the very *Elias* that they enquired after, who was to " go before the Lord to prepare his Way, though he " did not then know that he was that great Prophet."

Ans. This is worse than the other : Here he reinforces his Charge of Error against *John* in stronger and most explicit Terms.

First, That he was the very *Elias* whom the *Jews* expected or enquired after who was *Elijah* the Prophet ; whereas it is plain he was not.

Secondly, He perverts the literal Terms of the Text, confounding the Words *Elias* and *Prophet* ; makes them synonymous, and denotes *John* to have been erroneous concerning the Prophet too ; whereas it is very plain to any that can read *English*, that the *Jews* intended two distinct Persons by the Terms *Elias* and *Prophet* ; they propounded their Question distinctly, and he his Answer too. First, *Art thou Elias* ? And he saith, *I am not*. Secondly, *Art thou that Prophet* ? He answered *No*. And again they distinguish them, viz. *If thou sayst thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that Prophet*. What can be more discriminately express'd ?

As to what they intended by *that Prophet*, Expositors mostly take him for that Prophet of which *Moses* spake,
Deut.

Deut. xviii. 15. Some suppose that by *that Prophet*, they mean *Jeremiab*, whom they expected to come again to bring them the Ark of God, which, according to *2 Maccab. ii.* they imagined he had hid in a Cave; and *Mat. xxvii. 47, 49*, shews that they had such an Opinion.

It is most agreeable to conclude, that *John* very well knew the *Jews* carnal Conceptions about the Coming of *Elias*, and likewise in what respect he represented *Elias*. But with regard to *that Prophet*, in what Sense soever it was taken, his Negation implies a full Exclusion: He was a Representative of *Elias*, but not of either *Christ*, or *that Prophet*.

Page 115. "If thou art neither *Christ* nor *Elias*, says J. B. (for he leaves out *that Prophet*, still retaining his Mistake that he was the same Person with *Elias*) "why dost thou bring in a new Method, to introduce thy Profelytes into thy Profession? For thou canst have no Authority to introduce a new Ordinance, if thou hast no Credentials to begin a new Dispensation?" This he gives as the Meaning of the *Pharisees* asking *John*, *Why baptizest thou then if thou be not that Christ?* &c. "This Question, says J. B. very naturally implies, that Baptism was not then in practice among the *Jews*, as some Authors would perswade their Readers to believe."

Ans. I have observed J. B. in some Places to appear zealous for the Letter of the Text; but when that is not express enough for his Purpose, he is very liable to transgress and become obnoxious to his own Censure. He construes the Word *Baptize* to import a new Method, to introduce a new Ordinance, &c. Which is such a Signification assigned to *Baptism* as I never met with before. Should any of the Clergy, or their Adherents, who hold the Necessity of *Episcopal* Ordination, and that none are qualified to baptize without it, ask J. B. when baptizing, whether he is *Episcopally* commission'd, or in Holy Orders, (as they call it) and after he had answered *No*, they should again ask him, why he baptized
I then

then if he was not? &c. Would such a Question naturally imply that Water-baptism was never in practice in *England* before, or that he had introduced a new Ordinance or Dispensation? I say, would *J. B.* himself think such an Inference just or natural? I know he is not so weak as to be ignorant what Sort of *Logick* that would amount to: I admire at his Partiality, that he should presume to impose so upon his Readers! The *Pharisees* Question to *John*, *Why baptizest thou then*, related only to him as an Administrator, and very plainly shews that they were not at all Strangers to that Ceremony and its Use amongst them, but only to his Qualification and Authority as an Administrator thereof.

Had Water-baptism been wholly unknown to the *Jews*, they would have been so far from expecting or allowing that the *Christ*, *Elias* or *that Prophet*, might or would use it as a Rite to initiate Profelytes, that they would have exceedingly admired and wondred at the same as a strange and unheard of Novelty; and would most probably have queried what was the Meaning and Signification of such an Action. But their expecting and allowing that the *Christ*, *Elias*, or *that Prophet*, might use it as an initiatory Rite, is a most natural Implication that the same Ceremony was then in practice among them for the Initiation of Profelytes from *Gentilism* to *Judaism*. It is improbable they should have esteemed it of so much more Signification than other Ceremonies which they scrupled not to admit upon lesser Authority than of a great Prophet, had they not been accustomed to such a solemn Use of it as that of profelyting Persons to their Religion; so that it is so far from naturally implying that Water-baptism was not in practice then among the *Jews*, that it is a natural Implication, if not Indication, of the quite contrary Position.

2. That the *Jews* expected *John*, by baptizing with Water, was about to introduce a new Dispensation, as *J. B.* maintains, may be effectually answered by considering, that it was the fixed Opinion of the *Jews* that the

the Legal Dispensation was perpetual and unalterable, and that it would rather be reinforced and re-established by the Accession and under the Government of the Messiah, as is plain both from Scripture, primitive Antiquity, and the present Faith and Practice of the *Jews* themselves.

As for *John's* Ministration, it contain'd not the Injunction of any new System of Religion different from the *Mosaic*, but rather a strict * Reformation of the same, and had its Commencement and Virtual Duration entirely under the Law, whilst the first Covenant was in force; and as his Baptism was of the same Nature and Tendency with the Rites and Ordinances of the Law, they fell together, with Respect to their Use and Service in the Kingdom of Christ.

Pag. 117. " I think it also (*i. e.* baptizing Profelytes among the *Jews*) confronts the very Meaning of what is written, *Mat. xxi. 25, 26.*—*The Baptism of John whence was it? From Heaven or from Men?* To this Question they might have easily return'd an Answer, without Hesitation, that it was of Men, if it was a known Custom with them before."

Ans. Error in Ratiocination, or fallacious Reasoning, is the Bane of Controversy! Strip but *J. B's* Performance of this, and his Pages would be almost incredibly reduc'd, and this *Reply* abbreviated in proportion. Would he, or any else, account it good Logick to say, Because Water-baptism was practis'd among the *Jews* by human Authority for initiating Converts to their Religion: Therefore it was impossible that *John* could have any divine Authority for his Administration of Water-baptism, for the Discovery or Manifestation of Christ in his outward Appearance to *Israel*?

It is generally allowed that Sacrifice and Burnt Offerings were in practice among the *Gentiles* long before the Commencement of the Ceremonial Law: Would *J. B.* venture to assert from hence, that *Moses's* Injunction of

* *John* not giving them (the *Jews*) any Precepts of Life.

the Observation of Sacrifices and Burnt Offerings to the *Israelites* was not, nor could possibly be, from Heaven or of divine Authority, but borrow'd from the Practice of the *Heathen*? I am sure the *first* is as illogical as the *last*.

Ibid. “ If the Baptism of *John* was from Heaven, he “ did not borrow his Practice from the *Jews*, as our “ Author would vainly insinuate.”

Answ. Who he means by the Words *our Author* I am not very positive, whether it is *Barclay* or *myself*, but 'tis most probable to be the *latter*, because he has referr'd to my Book three or four Pages back; and then I must tell him he is as much mistaken here as he is in his Deductions above. I have fully express'd my Belief of the Authority of *John's* Mission in the seventh Page of my Book, saying, “ That *John* had a Com-
“ mand to baptize with Water we freely own the Text
“ is clear, *John* i. 33.” And this *J. B.* could not but know, so he is the more inexcusable in misrepresenting me. I think it may plainly appear, that I entertain a better Opinion of *John* and his Qualification than he and his Brother *O. Edwards* do: The *first*, as has been observed, declares him mistaken; and the * *Second* sets him forth to have been as a Reed shaken with the Wind in the Wilderness, and possessed with Doubts, &c. Whereas on the contrary, I believe that *John*, being filled with the Holy Ghost, had a right Understanding of the Prophet's Meaning; and that the Mistake was not on his, but on the *Pharisees* Side.

2. That he was so far from being like a shaken Reed, in respect of Faith, that he was constant, firm and steadfast to his very last Moments.

3. That he had a divine Command to administer Water-baptism, and for the same End and Purpose which he himself declar'd, *John* i. 31.

4. That he spoke by the Influence and Dictates of the Spirit of God when he made open Proclamation, which
all

* Second Stroke, page 35.

all the Evangelists have mentioned for the Benefit of future Ages, viz. that *Christ should baptize with the Holy Ghost*; and compar'd the same baptizing Gift of the Spirit, in its Operation upon the Souls, unto that of a *Fan upon Wheat*, &c. The which Evangelical Prediction I believe includes me and all Believers to the End of the World.

5. That, when he declar'd that himself *should decrease*, and *Christ should increase*, he had Relation to their Dispensations: So that he gave a plain Account, 1. Of his * Authority for baptizing with Water; 2. Of the End for which he administred it; 3. Of its Duration, as being temporary, and what would virtually decrease or become invalid when its End was answer'd, and its Antitype took Place; 4. As he had testified of his own Ministration, with respect to its Authority, End and Duration, so he plainly declar'd of Christ's spiritual Baptism, in relation to its Nature and Extent, as we have observ'd. *Mat. iii. 11, 12.*

What says *J. B.* and his Brethren to these Things, would they subscribe thereto? No, not to one Halt I fear, notwithstanding their professed Veneration for the Record of the Bible.

Page 118. “ Besides, our Opponents are not able to produce any Author for their imaginary Baptism, so early as 400 Years of *John Baptist's Days*.”

Ans. He is too positive again; How does he know they are not able to produce an Author within 400 Years? *Justin Martyr*, who lived *Anno 140*, makes mention, in his Discourse with *Trypho the Jew*, of Water-baptism that was then us'd among the *Jews*. *Tertullian*, who lived in the same Century, says, The *Heathen* were initiated into certain Religious Mysteries by Baptism. The Poet *Ovid*, in his second Book *Fastorum*, relates that Water-baptism was us'd among both the *Greeks* and *Romans*. With respect to the *Talmuds*, I shall only instance

* Which is more than *J. B.* and his Brother can do.

† Nam & scris quibusdam per Lavacrum initiantur. *De i. i. s. m.*

instance One, and that is, *Meschna*, or Text of the *Talmud*, said to be compiled by Rabbi *Judab Hackodeck* in the Time of *Antoninus Pius*, about 120 Years after the Death of *John* the Baptist, mentions, That the *Jews* initiated Profelytes by Baptism.

By what the *Roman* Poet says, Water-baptism was used by the *Heathen* before the Days of *John* : And *Tertullian* agrees thereto.

Justin Martyr and the *Talmud* do correspond and corroborate each other, respecting the *Jewish* Practice.

And though these Relations about the *Jews* were a Century or more of later Date than *John* the Baptist, yet there is reason sufficient to conclude, that what they then, and since that Time used, of Water-baptism, was a Continuation of what had been in practice amongst them before *John*.

1. It is highly improbable that the *Jews*, who had such an Aversion to the Name of a Christian, should begin to profelyte Persons to their Religion in Imitation of those that profess'd to be Followers of *Jesus* of *Nazareth*, whom they held accursed. It can't be imagin'd that they would ever have so far own'd him as to introduce a new Institution in Conformity to his Command, (supposing, but not granting, that Christ instituted Water-baptism) How would such an Innovation amongst them have escaped the particular Notice of Writers either *Jewish* or *Christian*?

2. They can't produce one ancient *Jewish* Writer who denies this Custom of baptizing Profelytes, while so many affirm * it.

3. I am the more inclinable to believe that these Accounts of *Christian*, *Jewish* and *Heathen* Writers, touching the *Jewish* Practice of Water-baptism before the Days of *John*, are true, because the holy Scriptures plainly intimate the same, especially that Discourse of the *Pharisees* with *John* the Baptist, *John* i. 25. The
Author

* As to *Knatchbull's* Pretence of Rabbi *Eliezer's* denying that such a Custom was among the *Jews*, it is sufficiently refuted by *Wall* in his History, in the Close of the Introduction.

Author to the *Hebrews* mentions * *divers Baptisms* that were in practice in the Legal Dispensation ; the Priests were baptized or washed at their Consecration, when they entred upon their Office, *Exod. xxix. 4.* see also *2 Chron. iv. 6.* where we have an Account of the vast brazen Sea which *Solomon* caused to be made for the same Purpose. As to the common Objection, viz. That these were not initiatory Baptisms used at the Entrance of Profelytes into the *Jewish Religion* ; is little or nothing to the Purpose : for neither was *John's Baptism* : it required no different Form of Religion, but what was enjoined in the *Mosaic*.

And they cannot deny but that it was used as a Ceremony, and symbolically by the *Jews* as well as by *John*, and that's enough.

Page 119. " I shall now proceed to examine, says
 " be, the grand Subterfuge of the Opposers of Water-
 " baptism, which they falsely infer from the Words of
 " St. Paul in *1 Cor. i. 14—16, 17.* *I thank God that I*
 " *baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius, &c. And*
 " *I baptized also the Household of Stephanas, besides, I*
 " *know not whether I baptized any other : For Christ sent*
 " *me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel, &c. —*
 " But because the Name of *Paul* was made use of to in-
 " crease and maintain their Distractions, he inquires if
 " they had been baptized in the Name of *Paul*, Verse
 " 13. and then he thanks God that he had baptized no
 " more of them, Verse 14. and in the 15th Verse he
 " assigns the Reason for his Thankfulness, viz. *Left*
 " *any should say he had baptized in his own Name ; or left*
 " *this should give Occasion for more of them to cry up*
 " *Paul*, and thereby increase the Faction with the Use
 " of his Name."

Ans. This, as well as some other Parts of his Discourse on this Text, is neither consistent nor very intelligible : but waving that at present, I do assure him it is so far from being our grand Subterfuge, that it is no
 Subterfuge

Subterfuge at all. We should not have been at a Loss to maintain our Cause without it; yet allowing at the same Time, that were there none else, it is ponderous enough of it self to turn the Scale against our Opponents respecting the Commission, *Mat. xxviii. 19.* Nor has it lost the least Grain of its Weight by *J. B.*'s Examination.

He, as well as the rest of our Opponents, takes abundance of Pains to prove what we never deny, but in a manner wholly omits to solve or make out the very Point in question. In pag. 60, 61, 62, and 63, in the Margin of mine, I fully answer'd our Adversaries Allegations thereon, especially *P. B.*'s and *O. Edwards* in his *Second Stroke*, and distinctly stated our grand Objection against their Doctrine by way of Question, and call'd upon them to answer; and likewise vindicated the literal Interpretation of the Apostles Words, maintaining that he spoke as he intended, shewing the Unreasonableness of *P. B.*'s and *O. E.*'s unwarrantable Addition to the Text, to make the Apostle speak or intend directly contrary to what he spoke in the Text, all which *O. E.* is so far from answering in his pretended Answer to my said Book, that he has not mention'd it, as thinking it quite the safest Way to pass it by without Notice, and let it rest as it is there, rather than run the Risque of solving the Question.

Nor has *J. B.* come off much better, though he undertakes to refute us, yet he intirely evades what we have said, nor offers at all to remove the Objection.

To what purpose was it for him to take up several Pages to prove that the Apostle thanked God, that he had baptized no more than two Persons of the *Corinthians*, was lest they should say, that he had baptized in his own Name. when I never deny'd, but freely granted it, saying, "Tis allow'd that *Paul* thanked God that he baptized not, for fear any should say he baptized in his own Name?" Was it to amuse the unwary Reader with an empty Pretence? Why did he not give Answer to my interrogatory Assertion containing the Matter in Debate, and immediately following the said Concession?

But

But they have not either of them inform'd us, why the Apostle should have been any more suspicious or fearful of their saying, that he baptized in his own Name, than that he preached in his own Name; if he had a Commission for the One as well as the Other; since 'tis evident enough, and I think generally held, that the *Corinthians* Contention and Variance was rather about their Ministers and Teachers, than Baptizers:

“ There were great Divisions and Contentions (says our *Norfolk* Author, pag. 23.) among the *Corinthians*, which were groundd upon the Emulation that arose among them in Behalf of their several Teachers.”

The Apostle is so far from any Apprehension of such a Construction being put upon his preaching the Gospel, that he pathetically illustrates and magnifies his Office herein, as it were even to the highest Degree, declaring, that it was in *Demonstration of the Spirit and Power*, Chap. xi. 4. *Though you have ten thousand Instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many Fathers; for in Christ Jesus have I begotten you through the Gospel.* Chap. iv. 15. *For Necessity is laid upon me; yea Wo is unto me if I preach not the Gospel.* Chap. ix. 16.

“ That the Baptism, which the Apostle administred was commanded him by Christ, as well as his Office of preaching the Gospel, and consequently the *first* as necessary to Salvation as the *last*, and yet that he should speak so very indifferently, nay disfavouably of the *first*, as not only to express Gratitude and Thankfulness for the Smallness of his Administration thereof; but also plainly to say, That Christ sent him not to do it; and to give such a quite contrary Relation concerning his Administration of the *last*, though what is assign'd as the Cause of his so-expressing himself concerning the *first*, is equally, yea more, affecting the *last*, are Points that want a Reconciliation, and which none of our Opponents have attempted to accomplish, though the same is

“ no more than what their own Assertions enjoin them. * ”

Secondly, Let it be observed, that, as the Reason of his Thankfulness for having baptized no more than *two*, was, lest they should have said, he baptized in his own Name ; so the only Reason why he did or had baptized no more but two of them, and the Household of *Stephanas* in all, was because he had no Commission of Christ to baptize. For, says he, *I baptized also the Household of Stephanas, besides, I know not whether I baptized any other ; for (or because) Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the Gospel.* Wherefore this Text contains two very strong Objections against the Practice of Water-baptism.

First, If he had had equal Authority for baptizing as he had for preaching the Gospel, he would not have been any more afraid, that their Division should affect Baptism, than Preaching, nor so much, because their Contention was chiefly, if not altogether, about their Preachers.

Secondly, The Apostle declaring, that (altho' he had continued so long in the Course of his Travels, and converted so many Thousands) he had baptized no more than two Persons and one Household in all, and to render no other Reason for his almost total Omission or Disuse thereof, but that *Christ sent him not to baptize*, is a convincing Argument, if not a plain Proof, that the Commission in *Matt. xxviii. 19.* has no Relation to Water-baptism ; and that neither himself nor any other Apostle had any Command from Christ to administer it.

The *First* of these Objections, our Adversaries evade without any Reply. — But the *Second* is so diametrically and uniformly opposite to their Doctrine and Practice

* Why did not *J. B.* and his Brother *O. E.* fairly solve this Question, and reconcile these things they are not only called upon for the Performance of ; but their own Assertion renders the same their indispensable Duty ? What Notice ought we to take of such evasive Triflers ?

Practice, that they are necessitated to exert themselves to the utmost, to find out some Expedient, some Device or Contrivance to invalidate and escape the Force of it. But how do they get over this? Why they scruple not to make the Apostle directly contradict himself, and would have us believe that he intended quite contrary to what he spoke.

But, according to this Way of expounding the Scripture, there would be no certain Meaning of any one Text, but all would be left to the Liberty of every sinister View and whimsical Fancy to be wrested, abused and perverted at Pleasure. Therefore we may justly esteem their Attempts of this Nature, viz, Foisting in their own Inventions into the sacred Text, to extort a Sense in Conformity to their own Notions, repugnant to the express Words of the Text itself, to be no better than great Presumption; and as such to be rejected.

Pag. 112. He says, "As the Scripture is to be explained by its own Light, shall attempt to prove that the Words of our blessed Saviour will serve to inform us herein, *John vi. 38. For I came down from Heaven, not to do mine own Will, but the Will of him that sent me.*"

Ans. I have observed this Text, and what *J. B.* discants upon it, but it is no way explanatory of *1 Cor. i. 17.* nor at all relative thereunto.——Tho' he or any else could give a thousand Places in Scripture that are Elliptic; they do not in the least affect this of the Apostle's, as I have plainly shewn in my former, pag. 63. 103, 104, 105, 106. Scarce any thing can be more weak and trifling, as well as ridiculous, than the Method our * Adversaries have taken to compel the Apostle to speak in Favour of their Practice. Because *John vi. 38. &c.* are elliptic, ergo, *1 Cor. i. 17.* must be so too. What can be more childish and irrational? I do assert 'tis no better Reasoning than to say, Because
O. E.

* *P. B.*, *O. E.* in his 2d. Stroke, and *J. B.*

O. E. a *Baptist* Preacher at *Dublin*, is guilty of * Forgery and Perversion : Ergo J. B. another *Baptist* Preacher must be guilty of the same.

J. B. has afforded as much Variety and Fertility of Invention in his Attempts against this Text, as any of our Antagonists : Whether O. E. has contributed to his Assistance herein, I shall leave.

In pag. 122. he would have the Word [Principally] thrust in. Pag. 123 the Word [Chiefly]——pag. 126. [Only]——But the Prettiest on't all, is pag. 124. where he makes the Apostle say, "*Christ sent him not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel, i. e. not to baptize, as a Work prior to his Preaching, but as consequent thereupon, or, not to baptize only, but first to preach the Word for the Conversion of Sinners, and then baptize such as are converted.*"

Answ. Does he suppose that the *Corinthians* entertained an Opinion that *Paul* was in the Practice of Baptizing prior to his Preaching ; or first baptized them, and then preached in Order to convert them afterward : And therefore to undeceive them, or rectify their Mistake, he tells them *Christ sent him not to do so* ? And, is it his Notion also, that the Apostle had converted no more than these two or three he had baptized ? For this evidently implies as much, representing him to speak thus, *I know not whether I baptized any other, because Christ sent me not to baptize before I taught and converted them.* But doth not the Apostle plainly intimate, that the Believers at *Corinth* were all converted by his Ministry, when he says, *Though you have ten thousand Instructors, yet have ye not many Fathers ; for in Christ Jesus have I begotten you thro' the Gospel.*

*Tis

* Concerning W. Penn. See the Supplement.

* 'Tis said that *Paul's* first Coming to *Corinth* was Anno Christi 52. and 17 Years after his Conversion ; where he first applied to the Synagogue. But they being obstinately opposite, he turned to the *Gentiles*, Acts xviii. 4. 6.

Corinth was a very populous and opulent City, Tully call'd it the Eye and Ornament of all † *Greece*. The Apostle's Continuance there, was about two Years, as may be gathered from Acts. xviii. 11. 18. In which Time (as he did not use to stay long in a Place, unless encouraged by the Success of his Ministry ; and that his Labour herein was infatigable) we may presume that the Number of Converts he made was not small. " The Scripture itself, Acts. xviii. 10. gives sufficient Evidence, says Lock, of a numerous Church gathered " there." And *Paul* wrote this first Epistle to them, about three Years after his said Visit, and twenty two Years after his * Conversion. So there was no Want of Time, Opportunity, nor Persons converted, to have frequently engaged him in the Administration of Baptism ; and he being of an incessant Application, Activity and Industry, 'tis improbable that he should be deficient or omisive in any one Point of his Commission, but would have punctually performed every Branch of the Duty of a Gospel Minister.

And as Matt. xxviii. 19. enjoyns Baptism with Preaching, he could no more discharge himself from the Performance of the first than the last by Deputation ; there is no more Liberty given to baptize than to preach by Proxy. Wherefore, had the Apostle only related matter of Fact, or how few he had baptized for so long a Time,

* The first Synod at *Jerusalem*, Acts xv. was in the 6th Year of *Claudius*, and 15 Years after Christ's Passion.

Cyrenus, P. Symon's Eccles. Hist. L. I. Cent. I. *Gorranus* in Gall. 1. 2. *Aretius* in Eundem. And *Paul's* Coming to *Corinth*, was four Years after. Locke.

† Lumen & Decus totius Græcæ, Cicero pro Leg. Manil.

* *Paul* wrote his first Epistle to the *Corinthians* Anno 56. And in the third Year of *Nero*. Locke. Rom. Hist.

a Time, and of so numerous a Company of Converts, without rendring any Reason why, it would have carried a strong Presumption that Water-baptism was no Part of his Duty, as a Minister of the Gospel, but what he had done therein, was by Permission, out of Condescension, as in the Case of several Jewish Rites, viz. Circumcision, Purification, &c. But then the Apostle not only relating his so great Omission in Point of Practice, but also giving so substantial a Reason for the same, viz. *That Christ sent him not to baptize*, this clinches the Nail, and sufficiently manifests, that his so much refraining from the Use of Water-baptism, was out of Choice in Conformity to his Commission.

Our Author J. B. treats very unsoundly on *John* vi. 38. "How then, says he, are we to understand our Lord, when he says, *I came down from Heaven not to do mine own Will, but the Will of him that sent me*, or the Will of his Father? Why, says J. B. certainly our Lord means hereby that he came to do his Father's Will, as prior to his own, since the giving of them (*i. e.* the Disciples. &c.) to Christ to redeem must be antecedent to his redeeming of them &c."

Ans. How can it be properly said that the Will of the Father, touching the Redemption of the World, or any other Purpose, should be prior to that of the Son; unless that the Will of the Son was at that Juncture, either contrary to the Will of the Father, or that the Son did not know the Father's Will, and consequently could not then concur therewith. Was the Will of the Son repugnant to the Father's at the Time of his giving them? Or was the Father's opposite to the Son's at the Time of redeeming them? He has given Cause for severe Animadversions, but I spare him.

Pag. 126. He pretends to answer the Objection, (That the Apostles, &c. did not use the Names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, when they baptized with Water) by Retortion, saying, "How, by this Way

of

“ of reasoning, can it be prov’d they used this Form of
 “ Words, when they (*as our Opponents say*) baptized
 “ with the Holy Ghost? — Or did the People
 “ call’d *Quakers* ever pretend to baptize in those vene-
 “ rable Names.”

Ans. This shews his great Mistake about the Mat-
 ter : We do not understand these Words, *in the*
Name of the Father, Son, &c. to relate to a formal Ex-
 pression of Words to be said in the Administration of
 Baptism; but to imply that, whereinto, or wherewith
 true Believers were to be baptized, according to the
 Terms of the Commission, viz. *teach—baptizing them*
*into the * Name of the Father, of the Son, and Holy Ghost.*
 But not to baptize or dip them into Water, repeating
 the Names, Father, Son, &c. as our Adversaries do,
 which is an Addition to the Text, and tends to make a
 being baptized into the Name (which frequently in Scrip-
 ture implies the Virtue and Power) of the Father,
 Son, &c. and into Water, to be synonymous; or one
 Action.

Pag. 127. “ Is there not as good Reason to conclude,
 “ that *Philip* baptized the *Eunuch* without any Form
 “ of Words or Names since the Scripture is silent there-
 “ in ? ”

Ans. No : Inasmuch as *Philip* baptized the *Sama-
 ritans* in the Name of the *Lord Jesus*, Acts viii. 16. it is
 most reasonable to conclude that he baptized the *Eunuch*
 so too. And that was the Form which *John* the Baptist
 used, as we have shewn.

Ibid. “ But certainly, this is a very unfair Way of Ar-
 “ guing, for unless there had been any Corruption
 “ practised by the Administrators of Baptism, it would
 “ be needless to give us an Account that they baptiz-
 “ ed in due Form, since the Account of their Baptism
 “ supposes it.”

Ans.

* *eis τὸ ὄνομα*, i. e. into the Name, Virtue, or Power of the
 Father, &c.

Answ. He still persists in his Mistake, as taking it for granted, that these Words in *Matt.* xxviii. 19. viz. *In the Name of the Father, &c.* were intended as a Form to be used in Water-baptism, and that the Apostles understood them as such, and practised the same when they baptized with Water; all which we deny, and it was his Part to have prov'd. But he has not produced one Syllable that any Way tends to a Probation of any one Point thereof.

We having no Intimation in Scripture, that the Apostles used any Form, when they baptized with Water, more than the Words which are said to be *John* the Baptist's, viz. *In the Name of the Lord, or Lord Jesus*, *Acts* viii. 16.—xi. 48. it is sufficient Evidence, that the Baptism which they used, was *John's*; and that their Compliance therewith was in Condescension to those with whom *John's* Administration was then fresh in Memory, and of great Esteem.

If our Opponents would act conformable to Scripture Example, why do they deviate from the Examples of *Philip* and *Peter*, *Acts* viii. 16—xi. 48. by adding several Words, in the Form of Baptism, to those which they used? Is not this tacitly to accuse the Apostles of Error, and declaring them *Heterodox* in the Administration of Baptism?

What Authority have they so widely to depart from the Words used by *Philip*, and the Apostle *Peter*, and instead thereof, assumingly to introduce, repeat and apply our Saviour's Words, *Matt.* xxviii. 19. to Water-Baptism, when they cannot give one Instance hereof in the Practice of the Apostles, nor the most distant Intimation that they ever so used them?

If our Adversaries cannot make it appear, that our Lord's immediate Followers did so use and apply his Words to Water-baptism, What can we esteem it short of Presumption, for any at this Time of Day, to venture to make such Use or Application thereof? Had our Antagonists used only these Words of *Peter* or *Philip*

Philip, they would have had at least something of Example for their Practice ; but as the Case stands, they have neither Precept nor Example.

For farther Satisfaction on this Head, I refer the Reader to my *Answer* to the *Norfolk* Letter, pages 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, which *J. B.* should have answered.

Pag. 128, 129. He undertakes to make appear, that Water baptism is intended by the Commission of Christ to his Apostles, and that the commanded Form therein was observ'd by them ; for the Proof of which, he says, " There is a very pertinent Passage in *Acts* xix. " from the 1st. to the 6th Verse inclusive, which is so " flagrant an Instance in Vindication thereof, and the " just Regard to the Form of Words joyn'd thereto, " that I can't but wonder *Mr. Foster* should attempt to " produce it as an Objection against this great Ordinance " of Christ."

When the *Ephesian* Believers, in Answer to *Paul's* Inquiring, *whether they had received the Holy Ghost since they believed*, had said, that *they had not heard whether there be any Holy Ghost* ; the Apostle asked them a second Question, v. 3. saying, *Into what then were ye baptized ?* " Now here it is evident, says *J. B.* that " the Apostle did not intend the Baptism of the Holy " Ghost in this second Query ; since they had in Answer to the first Question told him that they had not " heard of the Holy Ghost. The Question then must " refer to the Form used in their Baptism, or otherwise, " it will render it very impertinent and unbecoming a " Man of Reason to ask."

I do not suppose that the Apostle expected by his second Query that their Answer would have been, that they were baptized into the Holy Ghost, since they denied that they had heard of it. But his asking them, *Into what then were ye baptized*, very naturally implies, that he supposed that they might have been baptized with the Holy Ghost, before that they had answered his first Query.

For the Words (*into what*) have Reference (not to the Form, or a Sound of Words to be used, as he vainly imagines, but) to that whereinto, or wherewith they were baptized; and the Particle *for, then*, shews it to have Relation to something preceding, or mentioned before, and that was the Holy Ghost.

The Tendency of the Apostle's Discourse was not about Forms, mere verbal Expressions, or Sounds of Words used in any Ceremony whatsoever; but about what is of greater Importance, *viz.* the Participation of the Holy Ghost.

If the Apostle had any Relation to the Form of Words, we may reasonably think that he who was so much a Master of Words, would have express'd himself in a quite different Way.——Instead of asking them *into what* (which plainly and directly refers to the Matter wherewith they were baptized) he would undoubtedly have asked them, what the Person said, or what Form of Words he used when he baptized them. So that the Pertinency of the Passage for the Proof of *7. R's.* Assertion, and the Flagrancy of the Instance in Vindication thereof, is altogether imaginary and supposititious, and what he farther raises upon that Hypothesis falls for Want of Proof.

Page. 132. “ It must be granted by all unprejudiced
“ Christians, that Water-baptism is the one Baptism
“ mentioned in *Ephes. iv. 5.* and what is intended by the
“ Commission in *Matt xxviii. 19.* which was to conti-
“ nue to the End of the World.”

Ans. As this is already disproved, I shall take no farther Notice of it here, but in Answer to what he infers, touching *Ephes. iv. 5.* I shall transcribe what I have said, *viz.* “ Now since it is an incontestible Point,
“ that the Baptism with Water, and the Baptism with
“ the Holy Ghost, are two different Baptisms, and
“ distinct from each other. And the Apostle asserts no
“ more than one Baptism in the Christian Church,
“ *Ephes. iv. 5.* it must be allowed to be One of the
“ Two. To maintain it to be the first, *viz.* Water-bap-
“ tism,

“ tism, would be diametrically opposite to *Matt. iii.*
 “ *11. Mark. i. 8. Luke. iii. 16, 17. John i. 33.*
 “ which Texts declare Christ's Baptism to be the se-
 “ cond, viz. that of the Spirit; and it would be erroneous
 “ to suppose the Apostle intended any other but Christ's
 “ Baptism.

“ *Secondly.* It would make him perpetuate a Baptism
 “ which he confesses Christ sent him not to administer,
 “ *1 Cor. i. 17.*

“ *Thirdly.* It makes the Apostle confused and incon-
 “ sistent with himself, as our Opponent is, viz. To hold
 “ two Baptisms. For 'tis undeniable that he asserted
 “ the Baptism of the Spirit, *1 Cor. xii. 13.*

“ *Fourthly.* It represents the Apostle to continue a Bap-
 “ tism, which our Antagonists themselves frankly own,
 “ doth not save: See *Burkit* on *1 Pet. iii. 21.* Where-
 “ as the Baptism of Christ is as necessary to Salvation as
 “ Faith is, *Mark xvi. 16.*

“ *Fifthly.* It makes him assign a corporal Lotion for
 “ the Purgation of a spiritual Body; for of such a Body
 “ the Apostle speaks.

“ But on the other Hand, if we apprehend it to mean
 “ the last, viz. the Baptism of the Spirit, we shall
 “ avoid all those Absurdities, there will be a perfect
 “ Harmony and Coherence throughout, and the Bap-
 “ tism will be homogeneous with the Body to be
 “ baptized or washed by it; as the Body is a spiritual
 “ Body, so it is most consistent, that the Baptism,
 “ wherewith it is to be cleansed and sanctified, be a spi-
 “ ritual Baptism, agreeable to what the same Author
 “ delivered to the *Corinthians*, saying, *But ye are*
 “ *washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in*
 “ *the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.*
 “ *1 Cor. vi. 11.*

“ Nay, one would think the Case is indisputa-
 “ bly cleared up, by what he says, *1 Cor. xii. 13.*
 “ For as he told the *Ephesians*, there is one Body,
 “ and one Baptism; so he told the *Corinthians*,

“ that by one Spirit they were all baptized into one
“ Body.

“ To conclude this Head: Seeing the one Baptism
“ the Apostle speaks of, is undoubtedly the Baptism
“ of Christ, which is that of the Spirit, as is testified of
“ in the four Evangelists aforecited; yea, since this one
“ Baptism is undoubtedly the saving Baptism, and
“ since according to the Apostle *Peter's* Testimony,
“ it is not Water-baptism that saves. What can be
“ a more natural and just Consequence than that
“ this one Baptism is no other than the Baptism of the
“ Spirit? ”

Pag. 134. “ Mr. *Foster*, in Pag. 95. objects against
“ the Word *Figure*, in 1 *Pet.* iii. 21. and tells us, that
“ they account the original Word most properly signi-
“ fies *Antitype* in this Place; but as neither he nor his
“ Authors, whom he quotes, give any Reason why it
“ should be read, as he and Mr. *Barelay* would have
“ it, it gives me some Reason to conclude, that he is
“ not fully satisfied with his own Objection, any farther
“ than he accounts it may serve to evade the Force
“ of the Text, which stands so directly against their
“ Cause.”

Ans. If he had repeated (but he scorns to quote)
what I have cited of the several Authors, and the mate-
rial Passages of what I have said on the Place, it would
have been a better Proof of the Validity of our Reasons,
than his *ipse dixit*; which is not at all to be depended
upon in such Cases: For though he makes no Scruple to
say, that “ neither I, nor my Authors I have cited,
“ give any Reason why it should be read *Antitype*,” yet
if the Reader will peruse my Book from pag. 95. to 105.
he will find that I have given several Reasons why, and
which still remain unanswered.

Pag. 135. “ *First*, As the Apostle here does evi-
“ dently refer to a Baptism that washed the Flesh; or
“ else I conceive there would be no need for him to
“ intimate to us, that it is not that Part of Baptism,
“ which

“ which putteth away the Filth of the Flesh, that saveth.”

Ans. We always supposed that the Apostle here refers to Water-baptism when he says, *Not that whereby the Filth of the Flesh is put away.*

But how? Why the Mention he makes of Water-baptism, is only negatively, or by Way of Exclusion, as plainly declaring, that it is not the Baptism that saves; and consequently not of Christ's Institution. But let it be observ'd what a mean Shift *J. B.* has recourse to! He puts in the Words (Part of) whereby he makes the Apostle speak after this Manner, *viz.* Whose Antitype also (that Part of) Baptism doth now save us; not that Part of Baptism which putteth away the Filth of the Flesh, but that Part of Baptism which answereth a good Conscience.

Secondly. By making Water-baptism only a Part of Baptism he is egregiously inconsistent with himself when he says, * that “ Water-baptism is the one Baptism. I am confident, without the least Scruple, that there are no baptized Christians in the World, but those who have been covered in Water, in the sacred Names of the Eternal Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. — † That Immersion only is Baptism. The which Expressions do fully and clearly appropriate the Form or Title *Baptism*, solely to the meer external Action of Dipping in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.” — But his other Assertion above, makes this no more than a Part, and such a Part too, as is exclusive even of the Answer of a good Conscience. Wherefore he is apparently contradictory to himself.

I desire *J. B.* or any of our Adversaries, to shew us the Text which divides Water-baptism into two Parts, or makes such Distinctions or Divisions about it, as they do; they may be assured we shall esteem it no better than a little low Evasion, and a mean Piece of Contrivance

trivance to escape the Nature, Tendency, and genuine Sense, of the Apostle's Words, which stand so remarkably opposite to their Practice.

Ibid. " For if he had referred unto two distinct Baptisms, certainly we might have expected an Explanation of his Meaning, in as plain Words as follow, viz. The like Figure whereunto Baptism doth also now save us; not that Baptism which washeth Flesh, &c.

Ans. We have frequent mention made in the New Testament of two distinct Baptisms, viz. one with Water, and the other with the Holy Ghost, and the Apostle Peter in this Text, after having said that Few, only eight Persons, were saved in the Ark on the Waters, adds, whose Antitype Baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away the Filth of the Flesh, but the Answer of a good Conscience towards God) by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. *

Observe first, The Relative (whose) refers to the Ark its Antecedent.

Secondly, Baptism, the Antitype thereof, must necessarily, according to Scripture Phrase, signify, either that of Water, or that of the Spirit. But lest any should be so carnal, in their Notions, as to think he intended the first, viz. Water-baptism, he has interposed the explanatory Parenthesis; in which he first negatively declares what it is not; saying, *Not the putting away the Filth of the Flesh*, which is the proper Effect of Water-baptism; then affirmatively what it is, viz. *the Answer of a good Conscience towards God*; which, as Dr. Burkit says, is the singular Effect of Inward-baptism.

Wherefore

* In a Translation, printed in Queen Elizabeth's Reign, 1597, it is thus rendered, " Whereof the Baptism that now is, answering that Figure (which is not the putting away of the Filth of the Flesh, but a confident Demanding, which a good Conscience maketh to God) saveth us also, by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ."

Wherefore the Word Baptism is as necessarily understood in the Negative, as in the Affirmative; and these two different Baptisms, producing these two different Effects, the One Cleansing the Body, the Other Purging and Sanctifying the Conscience; must certainly be the two Baptisms so often mentioned in several preceding * Parts of the Scripture, viz. Water-baptism, and the Baptism of the Spirit. And as the Apostle here ascribes Salvation to the *latter*, but rejects or excludes the *former*; it is our Duty and Interest to chuse and embrace that only, to which the Apostle has so peculiarly and signally given the ** Preference.

Pag. 135. " Secondly, I desire to know what our
" Opponents will do with the two precedent Words in
" the Text, viz. (the like) for if these are not falsely
" translated, their Objection is not worth a Rush; be-
" cause it spoils the Connexion of the Text which will
" easily be perceived by reading the Words, and put-
" ting Antitype instead of Figure, and then they will
" read thus, the like Antitype whereunto even Bap-
" tism doth now also save us. What pitiful mang-
" ling

* Matt. iii. 11. Mark i. 8. Luke iii. 16. John i. 33.
Acts i. 5.

**Fuit enim illa Noe Conservatio in aquis, nostri Baptismi figura, minime id quidem quasi materialis illa Baptismi aqua nos servet.

—Sed quia Christus vi sua Interiore, quam Baptismus exterior adumbrat, nos ablutos conservat, ut possimus Deum bona Conscientia invocare. Conscientia Sanctificata potest libere Deum invocare. Eadem illa Virtus qua Christus resurrexit, & nunc in Caelum erectus omnem Potestatem accepit, nos hodie tuetur ac conservat. Beza Comment. in 1 Per. iii. 21.

For that Preservation of Noah, says Beza, in the Waters, was a Figure of our Baptism: Not in any wise as if that material Water of Baptism can save us: But because Christ by his inward Power, which the outward Baptism is a Shadow of, preserveth us cleansed, that we may with a good Conscience call upon God. A sanctified Conscience may call upon God freely. That same Virtue by which Christ rose again, and being now ascended into Heaven hath received all Power, defends and preserves us at this Day.

ling Work will this make of the Text, notwithstanding the Opinion of Mr. *Foster*, and Mr. † *Barclay*."

Ans. I do not see how *J. B.* can escape the Imputation of Disingenuity here! Why does he ask what his Opponents will do with the Words (the like) ——— and then represents us making the Apostle speak nonsensically, viz. *The like Antitype, Baptism, &c.*?

Can any thing be plainer than what I have expressed in Pag. 101, of this very Particular, viz. ὅς τῃ ἡμῶν τῶν σώσει βάπτισμα, *Whose Antitype Baptism now saves us?* What Reason was there then, for such a false and foolish Insinuation, and then to cry, What pitiful mangling Work, &c.?

There is no such Word as (*like* or *likeness*) as I have rendred it according to the Original; and herewith agreed, *Grotius*, *Dr. Hammond*, *Beza*, *Aretius*, *Gerhardus*, *Cameron*, *Vitabulus*, *Piscator*, &c.

So it is obvious that his Charge of pitiful Mangling, &c. no way appertains to us; but it is most applicable to himself, and his learned Brother *G. S.* who perus'd his Performance, and suffered such a Blunder to pass his Correction:

Pag. 136. "I cannot but esteem this Objection against the Translation of the Text a mere Shift, since it gives us just Cause to wonder that those able Linguists, who have taken to examine and correct the false Translations of the Bible, should not take Notice of this Word, and inform us what is the just Sense of the Original.

Ans. To esteem it a mere Shift, because the Mistake was not corrected, or notified by those able Linguists he speaks of, implies as much as if he ascribed Infallibility to their Performances, and holds that Error or Mistake could not possibly have escaped or descended from their Pens; and consequently no Corrections or Amendments

Amendments to be made in any Part of the Bible after their Examination thereof. But who were those able Linguists he refers to? Were they those appointed in K. *James* the first's Reign, above an hundred Years ago? If so, will he say there has been no Objection against the Translation since? I could shew him many, made by learned Men of the same Church, and who we may suppose were as well skill'd in the Original, and of as clear Understanding in the Mysteries of Religion, as those *J. B.* has relation to.

Pag. 137. " We esteem it (*i. e.* 1 Pet. iii. 21.) a
" Bulwark against Sprinkling, and I trust it will re-
" main so, unless the Opposers of Water-baptism will
" lend them an helping Hand to remove this For-
" tress."

Ans. 'Tis certainly a Bulwark, and an immoveable Fortress against Sprinkling, and Dipping too, as they are held for Christian Baptism. And of this our Opponents are not unsensible, which makes them rack their Inventions to find out some Device to escape the genuine Sense and natural Tendency of this as well as that of the Apostle *Paul*, 1 Cor. 12, 13. But their Attempts have only exposed the Weakness and Indefensibility of their Cause.

J. B. is very close upon the *Pedo-baptists*, for offering to force and wrest any Text from the most obvious and literal Sense in Favour of their Practice, but he quite forgets to take this Caution to himself; when any Scripture Passage makes against him, he is as ready (and his Brother *O. E.* too) to become obnoxious to his own Censure as any Person.

Ibid. " I think we can still maintain our Ground so
" far as to prove that Water-baptism is intended by
" the Text, since the Apostle in the very next Words
" to the Text, speaks of eight Persons that were saved
" from the destroying Deluge, being saved by Water,
" in Order to introduce his Observation of Baptism,
" and the Salvation which it points out to Us, as it
" represents the Resurrection of Christ, which was the
M " Com-

“ Completion of his redeeming Work.——I can’t but
 “ esteem the Whole of the Text a loud Testimony for
 “ Water-baptism.”

Answ. The manifest Absurdities and Self-contradictions this Opponent (as well as his Brother O. E. in his 2d Stroke) hath rushed into, in treating of this very Text, not to mention the rest, are enough to expose the Christian Religion, to the Contempt of its Enemies.

Pag. 135. he says, “ The Apostle speaks of one
 “ Baptism only throughout the Text; and distinguish-
 “ eth between the outward Part of it, and the Mystery
 “ contained in it —— viz. the Death, Burial, and
 “ Resurrection of Christ.” According to which we
 must understand the Apostle’s Meaning to run thus :
 Water-baptism, which now saves us, is not Water-bap-
 tism, but the Resurrection of Christ, by the Resurrection
 of Jesus Christ.

Pag. 136. He makes the Apostle speak after this
 Manner, viz, “ Baptism only the Figure of what
 “ Saves, is not the Figure of what Saves; but the Re-
 “ surrection of Christ, by the Resurrection of Jesus
 “ Christ.”

Pag. 137. he says, “ The eight Persons were saved
 “ from the destroying Deluge, being saved by Wa-
 “ ter.” —— Here he makes a Conversion of his
 Terms; before he held the Ark to resemble Baptism,
 but now makes the Waters of the Deluge to repre-
 sent it.

The Comparison then must run thus; as the eight
 Persons were saved by Water, or by the Ark on the
 Waters, from corporal Death; even so are we now
 saved by Water-baptism from spiritual Death. This
 Conclusion is naturally and justly drawn from my Anta-
 gonist’s Premises. To hold that Water-baptism is in-
 tended, unavoidably fixes this Inference upon them.
 Also in this Paragraph, pag. 138, he makes another
 Conversion of his Terms. Pag. 135. he holds that *the*
Answer of a good Conscience implies the Mystery, viz,
 Christ’s

Christ's Resurrection ; but here he makes it refer to the Ends of Baptism. — So the Text must now be thus expounded : Water-baptism which now saves, is not Water-baptism, without it be conscientiously performed ; but Water-baptism performed, or received with a conscientious Regard to the Resurrection of Christ by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

These are the Scope and Substance of *J. B's.* and * *O. E's.* Manner of Reasoning (upon this † Portion of sacred Writ) which is in itself so obviously heterodox and absurd, that the very Mentioning thereof, may be Answer sufficient.

“ The Text speaks of the eight Persons that were
“ saved from the destroying Deluge, being saved by
“ Water.”

Had he said they were saved from the destroying Deluge, or Water, by the Ark, it would have been more agreeable to the Text, and to real matter of Fact as related, *Gen.* vii. and viii. which wholly ascribes their Preservation, not to the Water, which was the Means of Destruction, but to the Ark wherein they were saved from the mortiferous Violence of the ** Water. But to say that they were saved from the destroying Deluge, or Water, by Water, is such an *Ænigmatical Paradox*

M 2

as

* *O. E's.* 2d Stroke, p. 81, 82, 83. † 1 Pet. iii. 21.

** *D. Petrus* 1 Epist. 3d. Vers. 21 Baptismum vocat ἀρκα τοῦ νοῦχ^{ου} arcae Noachi ; nimirum quia conservatio Hominum in arca Tempore Diluvii est Typus Conservationis Fidellum ab Iræ Divinæ Diluvio per Baptismum. Gerhard. de bonis Oper. 6. 2. p. 212. St. Peter calls Baptism the Antitype of the Ark of *Noah* ; to wit, because the Preservation of Men in the Ark, in the Time of the Deluge, is a Type of the Saving of the Faithful from the Deluge of divine Wrath by Baptism. Gerhard. de bonis Oper. &c.

Aretius, a Protestant Reformer in Germany, as was also *Gerhardus*, says — Figura est Baptismi — Christi meritum Animos purgat — *Noah's* being saved in the Ark, was a Type of Baptism — 'Tis the Power of Christ which cleanses the Soul Εἰς ἣν (τὸν ἑνὸς ὁὔλου) ψυχὰς διασωθῆναι δι' υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. In qua paucæ (id est octo) animæ servatæ sunt in Aqua, i. e. In which Ark, being on the Water, few (only eight) Souls were saved

as is most suitable to the Author himself, or else his Brother O. E. to unfold.

Pag. 138. " That the Baptism of the Holy Ghost
" can be hereby intended, is, I think, beyond the Ca-
" pacity of any Man to make out ; since that was
" altogether Miraculous——and therefore could not
" refer to the Intent of the Subject, but was solely the
" Pleasure of God, and therefore, not the Answer, or
" Stipulation of their Conscience.

Ans. He is intirely mistaken here in both Parts :
First, That the Baptism of the Holy Ghost was altoge-
ther miraculous and amazing in its Effects, is what we
have fully refuted as an erroneous and absurd Notion.
Secondly, That Conversion, or turning from Dark-
ness to Light, from the Power of Satan to God, thro'
spiritual Baptism, or the sanctifying Efficacy of the
Holy Ghost, requires an Exercise of Mind in the Sub-
ject, and much superior, to what is commonly experi-
enced, or even requir'd, in the Administration of Wa-
ter-baptism is so self-evident, that to hold the contrary
would be to assert a down right Falsity. In a Word,
since the Baptism here intended, is the Antitype of the
Ark, and the Apostle by an Antithesis opposes the One
to the Other ; making an apt Allusion and Similitude
betwixt the Type, and the Antitype. As they were sa-
ved by the Ark, the Type, from corporal Death, so
are we now saved by Baptism, the Antitype, from spiri-
tual Death ; and at the same Time declaring that it is
not the putting away the Filth of the Flesh (which necessa-
rily implies Water-baptism) *but the Answer, or*
* *Inquiry, of a good Conscience towards God, by the*
Resurrection

" * ἐπερωτημα Interrogatio ——— quo fit ut bona conscientia
Deum interroget. *Beza.* Petrus, enim pulcherrima Appellatione
Baptismum vocat ἐπερωτημα εἰς Θεον. 1 *Per.* iii. 21. Et quando in
Veter. Testim. in Caula aliqua os Domini interrogabant, ut
certi redderentur, quomodo Deus in tali Casu affectus esset erga
iplos, Græci semper usurpant Verbum ἐπερωταὶ ἐκ κρυπτῶν, & sic
ἔπειτα, Chemnic. Harm. Evang. C. 17. Edit. Genev.

" *Peter*

Resurrection of Jesus Christ ; put metonymically for the * Power and Spirit of God, whereby Jesus was raised from the Dead, according to † *Rom. viii. 11.* it unanswerably determines it to be the Baptism of the Spirit. Nothing can save but what is spiritual ; nothing can raise an Inquiry after God, or effect the Answer of a good Conscience towards him, but the internal Operation of the Holy Ghost : By one Spirit, saith the Apostle, we have an Access unto the Father, *Eph. ii. 18.*

We have only one Particular more to examine ; and that is touching *J. B's.* Exposition of what the Apostle has delivered, *Rom. vii. 3, 4. Col. ii. 12.* where he says, *Know you not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his Death ? Therefore we are buried with him by Baptism into Death, that like as Christ was raised up from the Dead by the Glory of the Father,*

“ *Peter* by an elegant Application, calls Baptism an Inquiry after God, *1 Pet. iii. 21.* And when in the Old Testament, they inquired at the Mouth of the Lord, concerning any Matter that they might have an Evidence, or certain Knowledge, whether such their Undertaking was approv'd of in the Sight of God ; the *Greeks* (the 70 Interpreters) always use the Verb, *ερωταν*, to inquire *εν κυρι* of the Lord, and *δια κυρι* by the Lord.

“ Baptismum ita describit *Petrus*, *1 Ephes. iii. 21.* Quod salvos nos faciat, non quo carnis sordes abjiciantur, sed quo fit ut bona Conscientia Deum interroget per Resurrectionem Jesu Christi. — Hujus Loci est observatio illa, quod 70 Interpret. Vocabulo *ερωταν* Utuntur, quando Vetere Test. p. 327. *Israelitae* dicuntur interrogare os Domini. *Gerhar. Loco. Theo. p. 327.*

“ *St. Peter* describes the Baptism which saves us, not to be that whereby the Filths of the Flesh are put away, but that whereby a good Conscience may ask, or inquire, of God. We must observe that the 70 Interpreters use the Word *ερωταν* when the *Hebrews* are said to inquire at the Mouth of the Lord.

So it is most properly and significantly too, rendred an Inquiry after, or seeking unto God, by the Spirit or Power that raised Jesus from the Dead.

* Eadem illa Virtus, qua Christus resurrexit ; the very same Power whereby Christ rose again, &c. says *Beza* on the Place.

† If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the Dead dwell in you, &c.

Father, even so we also should walk in Newness of Life — Buried with him in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen, thro' the Faith of the Operation of God, who hath raised him from the Dead. And in Gal. iii 27. For as many of you, as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.

The which, J. B. pag. 21, 22. thus Expounds, viz, “ That as the Persons baptized, have in a Figure
“ represented their Saviour's Death and Resurrection,
“ so they profess to die and rise with him; that as he
“ died for Sin, and rose from under the heavy Load
“ thereof — So hereby they profess to be under the
“ most engaging Bonds to dye daily unto Sin, and
“ walk in Newness of Life, to the Honour of his holy
“ Religion.”

How apparently he has perverted the most obvious and conspicuous Sense of the Apostle's Doctrine in these several Epistles? He has allegorized away that living moving Principle, the efficacious and internal Operation of the Holy Spirit, upon the Souls of the Faithful, to a mere elementary and external Shadow or Representation.

Where the Apostle says, *We are baptized into Christ's Death, and buried with him by Baptism into Death,* and thereby clearly sets forth that the Baptism is such as produces in us a real Death unto Sin, as Christ died for Sin; a putting off and Burial of the first Nature or Body of Sin; as Christ's Vail of Flesh or Humanity was buried. J. B. and his Brother O. E. &c. make no more of it than a Resemblance of the Death and Burial of Christ, by Dipping the Body into Water.

And when the Apostle says, *Like as Christ was raised up from the Dead, by the Glory of the Father, even so we should walk in Newness of Life — Buried with him in Baptism, wherein also we are risen by Faith of the Operation of God who hath raised him from the Dead — As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ:* All which imports a real Change and Renovation of Soul effected through Baptism, or the sanctifying

ing Operation of the Spirit of God: They, our Opponents, maintain it to imply only a Representation and Profession hereof exhibited by the Persons Emerſion, or riſing out of the Water when dipp'd! "The Persons baptiz'd, ſay they, have in a Figure represented their Saviour's Death and Reſurrection, ſo they profeſs to die and riſe, &c." The which is ſuch an apparent Perverſion of the moſt expreſs and obvious Senſe of the Text, and Context, and diſcovers ſuch a Degree of empty Formality, as I muſt confeſs, I ſcarce expected to have met with from the Pen of any Proteſtant, eſpecially a Diſſenter.

What J. B. infers from theſe, and which he very much inſiſts upon, as deciſive in Favour of the Mode of Dipping, is no better than a vain Imagination ariſing from a Miſrepresentation and falſe Gloſs put upon thoſe ſacred Paſſages,

I ſhall wind up this *Reply* with theſe brief Obſervations thereon,

First, That the Apoſtle in theſe three Epiſtles written to three diſtinct Churches, ſpeaks of Baptiſm (not as a Shadow or Representation) but as a living, moving, efficacious Principle, operating and producing in the Mind ſuch a State and Condition, as he metaphorically denominates, a being dead and buried with Chriſt, riſen with, and putting on Chriſt, and walking in Newneſs of Life. For, ſays he, *As many of us as are baptized into Jeſus Chriſt, are baptized into his Death—we are buried with him by Baptiſm into Death, that we ſhould walk in Newneſs of Life—buried with him in Baptiſm—in Baptiſm ye are riſen—as many of you as have been baptized into Chriſt, have put on Chriſt.* By all which it is indifputably evident that the Apoſtle predicates of Baptiſm, in theſe three Epiſtles, as of what really produces ſuch an eminent Change in the Soul, or inward Man, and of the ſame, as being the proper and genuine Effect of Baptiſm.

Secondly, That nothing ſhort of the internal Operation of the Holy Spirit can poſſibly produce ſuch Effects

in the Mind of Man. And as the Apostle ascribes the same unto Baptism as the Effect thereof, or what is produced thereby, the Baptism here intended must be allowed to be that of the Holy Ghost: To suppose it to be that of Water, would be absurd Superstition, if not Idolatry.

Thirdly, That this great Change and Alteration in Man's intellectual State or Condition here spoken of, as produced by the Baptism of the Spirit, implies no less than a real Conversion and Regeneration, is I presume clear even beyond Contradiction, and what will readily be assented unto by all.

Fourthly, From hence it necessarily follows, as an undeniable Consequence, that Conversion or Regeneration is the Effect of spiritual Baptism—The very Terms of the Texts are equivalent to such a Conclusion; to say we are dead and buried with Christ, and raised to Newness of Life by Baptism, are Words of the same import and signification, as to say, we are converted, sanctified and regenerated by Baptism.

Fifthly, These Texts are so plain and direct against the Practice of Water Baptism, that it is very strange that they should offer to alledge them in Favour of it: Their Perversion by such an Application of the Apostle's Words is so visible, and their Reasoning thereon so confused, and inconsistent with the Nature of the Case, that there needs no other Demonstration hereof, but to compare the Texts with what they assert.

Sixthly, Since this great and eminent Minister, Apostle or Messenger of Christ to the *Gentiles*, by divine Inspiration, through the immediate Guidance and Dictates of the Spirit of Christ, so clearly and emphatically treated of and set forth to the several Churches he wrote unto, viz. To the Church at *Rome*, at *Corinth*, *Galatia*, and *Coloss*, the Power, Virtue, and excellent Effects of spiritual Baptism, and also in that to the Church at *Ephesus*, taught, that there is *one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism*; we have reason sufficient firmly
to

to believe that there is no Christian Baptism, but only that of the Holy Spirit. For as the blessed Effects, which the Apostle ascribes thereunto, render this Baptism Essential, and give it Perpetuity ; So his asserting but one Baptism, fully excludes any Other, and establishes this as the one Essential Baptism.

A N
A P P E N D I X,
B E I N G

An EXAMINATION of *Oswald Edwards's* Pamphlet, call'd *A fourth Stroak*, &c. dated *September the 7th. 1738.*

THIS last Attempt of *O. E's*. consists of two Letters, the *first* directed to *My self*, being a pretended *Answer* to my *Reply to Bedingfield*, Author of the *Norfolk Letter* : The *second* is directed to *May Drummond*.

He queries, in several of his Pages, “ Why I did “ not answer his *second Stroak*,” as he calls it.

To which my *Return* is, That *Joseph Gill*, whom he pretended to refute, was capable enough to make *Reply*, had *O. E's* been thought worthy of a particular *Answer* ; for in answering his *first*, he had given him such an effectual Overthrow, that he was never able to recover his Ground, as is plain to any impartial Reader, notwithstanding *O. E's* Pretences——However my abovesaid Book is so composed as fully to answer whatsoever is Argumentative in his said *Stroak* ; and for that Reason I made him a Present of One of them, that he

N
might

might see himself refuted, though not altogether Nominally, but Virtually in Conjunction with others, using for the most Part the same Allegations in different Words.

And now after four or five Years Consultation, he has sent out what he is pleased to call *A full Answer*, but it is so far from being such, that properly speaking, 'tis no Answer at all; for he has only touched one or two Particulars, and dropt all the rest of the Controversy; and before we can come at this too, we must pass to the 11th or 12th Page: The preceding Part is little else but a rodomontading Ramble of Scurrility, Tautology, ridiculous Banter, &c. and the Subsequent much of the same Stamp.

Page. 11. " If thou, or any of the *Quakers*, do
" think it convenient to enter the Lists with me, I
" shall keep the Debate between us for the Future,
" within those narrow Limits to which, in those Stroaks,
" I have reduc'd it.——For now the whole Contro-
" versy turns upon this Hinge, *i. e.* upon this single
" Question, Whether the Baptism commanded in the
" 28th of *Matthew* be Water-baptism, or the Baptism
" of the Holy Ghost? "

Ans. He faintly puts the Query, " if thou, &c.
" think it convenient to enter the Lists with me," When he very well knows that I have entred the Lists with him, by answering his Arguments, and sending a Book of the same; to which I might have reasonably expected either his Silence or satisfactory Answer; but am intirely disappointed in both Parts. He had not Generosity and Courage enough to acquiesce with the First; nor Matter and Ability to accomplish the Last——But has visibly enough acted the Part of a whifling Antagonist. In his other, he could boldly " challenge any *Quaker*
" upon the Globe to answer him." So full was this Man of himself! And being now under the Engagement, how has he acquitted himself? Most pusillanimously! He has shamefully evaded all his Opponents Arguments and Reasoning; and urged his Allegations and Objecti-
ons

ons afresh, in the Points he touches, as if unanswered, tho' fairly refuted.

Pag. 11. " It is agreed upon by all Parties, that
 " the Baptism there commanded, is a Baptism which
 " must be administred by Men,——*Go teach all Na-*
 " *tions, baptizing them*; so that it must and will be
 " granted, that if we prove that the Baptism of the
 " Holy Ghost cannot be administred by Men, we shall
 " thereby prove that the Baptism which our Lord
 " commands is Water-baptism. Upon the whole it is
 " evident, that the Points in difference upon the pre-
 " sent Question, between the *Baptists* and the *Quakers*,
 " lies in these three Particulars.

" *First*, The *Quakers* say, that the Baptism of the
 " Holy Ghost can be administred by Men; the *Bap-*
 " *tists* say it cannot.

" *Secondly*, The *Quakers* say, that the Baptism of
 " the Holy Ghost is administred by the Act of Teach-
 " ing; the *Baptists* say it is not.

" *Thirdly*, The *Quakers* say, that Conversion or
 " Regeneration is the Baptism of the Holy Ghost;
 " the *Baptists* say it is not."

Ans. O. E. has undertook in his first and second Attempts against the People called *Quakers* to prove, that Water-baptism is a Gospel Ordinance of perpetual Obligation, and they Antichristian in not using it. But finding himself deeply distressed in the Prosecution of his Design, and unable to maintain his Post, he now is very willing to change the Scene, to turn the Opponent into the Respondent, and act no longer in the affirmative Part, but in the negative; instead of persisting as an Affirmant in the Defence and Probation of his grand Assertion or Proposition, *i. e.* that Baptism is an Ordinance of the Gospel, &c. he shrinks back and deserts his Cause, requiring his Antagonist to prove the contrary Position.

And though this is a Stratagem which Necessity has pressed our Opponent upon, and is clearly indicative of the Imbecillity of his Cause, yet we are ready to allow him all the Advantage it will afford.

But

But what Satisfaction is there to controvert with a Person of that Disingenuity and Meanness, who reiterates and represses Objections against, and Negations of, what has been fully and clearly proved by Arguments deduced from Scripture and Reason ; and passes wholly regardless of the same, as if no Answer had been made ?

We have, as we think, not only sufficiently refuted what he has offer'd in Defence of his Tenet, but effectually proved the contrary Doctrine, to all which he has given the *Go by*, and repeats his Negations thereof : And with what Consistence he supports them shall now be our Business to examine.

He makes the Point in difference on this present Question between us and the *Baptists*, (admitting them only as Negators) to lie in three Particulars ; but properly consider'd, it is reducible to, and consists but of two Propositions, viz. 1. *What spiritual Baptism is ?* 2. *Whether administred by Men ?*

First, We affirm, that the Baptism of the Holy Ghost implies Conversion, or such a Communication of the holy Spirit as will wash, cleanse and sanctify the Soul, if not neglected or resisted.

For proof of this Proposition, I refer the Reader to my Book call'd *A Vindication of the Doctrine of Baptism*, &c. from pag. 13 to 41, (one of which I sent O. E. to peruse) where the Point is fully discuss'd and established by the Authority of the holy Scripture, and concurring Testimonies of approv'd Theologists of most Communion, viz. *Romanists*, *Episcopalians*, *Presbyterians*, *Baptists*, &c. And the preceding Pages in Reply to his Brother *Burt*, where the Assertion is further reinforced, vindicated, clear'd up, and settled in Opposition to all our Adversaries Objections.

Secondly, That the Baptism of the Holy Ghost was administred by Men, as the instrumental Means, thro' the Influence of the Spirit of Christ, as the principal and efficient Cause, we also affirm ; and for Probation hereof, I refer to my aforesaid Book, from pag. 73 to 91, where this Particular is treated of *ex professo*, and fully

clear'd

clear'd up; as I have also observed in the Pages aforegoing, in Answer to *J. B.* And when *O. E.* or *J. B.* or any other of our Adversaries have fairly examined and refuted, if they can, what is there advanced, I hope we shall not be unprepared to answer. And if they, or either of them, had acted the Part of a Gospel Minister, or as Persons concerned for the Cause of Truth, they would have treated fairly, and ingenuously drawn forth and answered what we have offer'd in Defence of our Doctrine, before they had repeated and urged what is there so fully answered, since the chief End of Controversy is to convince the Opponent.

But to proceed to an Examination. *O. E.* having stated and handled the Question preposterously, I am obliged to restate it in due Order, which occasions the more Trouble to collect his Assertions so immethodically and confusedly interspersed.

To disprove the first Proposition, viz. *That Conversion is, or implies, the Baptism of the Spirit*, he says, pag. 14. "Now since it is manifest, that *Philip* converted them, and baptized them with Water, and yet did not baptize them with the Holy Ghost, it will follow, first, that it is not in Man's Power to baptize with the Holy Ghost. Secondly, that the Baptism of the Holy Ghost is not administred by the Act of Teaching. Thirdly, that Conversion is not the Baptism of the Holy Ghost."

Answ. To maintain these three negative Propositions, he must first prove from the Text, that *Philip* converted the *Samaritans*, of which Number *Simon* must be one, (for Converted is not the Term in the Text) without the Influence of the Holy Spirit upon them, or else they are all without Foundation, and only introduced to serve his present Purpose. For, in his *Second Stroak*, pag. 60, he confesses that no Man is converted or turned from Sin to God, without the internal Operation of the holy Spirit.

If the *Samaritans* were converted, and Conversion be produced by the internal Operation of the Spirit; then
so

so far as they were converted through the Operation of the Spirit, in an Evangelical Sense, so far were they baptized with the Spirit. Conversion, as his Brother *J. B.* well observes, implies a spiritual Washing and Immersion, which they themselves make synonymous with Baptism, or necessarily to imply it, as we have before observed.—'Tis Baptism according to the Etymology of the Word.

So what *O. E.* here brings to refute us, being taken together with his other Concession, evidently confirms our Doctrine, refutes himself, and renders him inconsistent.

Pag. 24. Prop. 1. "The Apostles were converted
"or regenerated before the Day of *Pentecost*."

Prop. 2d. "Those Persons whom *John* the Baptist
"did convert, and to whom he gave Water-baptism,
"were not baptized with the Holy Ghost until the
"Day of *Pentecost*. Consequently."

Prop. 3d. "Conversion, or the New Birth, is not
"the Baptism of the Holy Ghost."

That in Page 41 is of the same Sort of Logick with these, therefore one *Answer* is sufficient for all.

But why did he pass by *Enoch*, *Noah*, *Abraham*, *Lot*, and all the Righteous from *Adam* until *Christ*? Will he exclude them all as unconverted? he might to as good Purpose have made a distinct Syllogism of every converted Person mentioned in Scripture, from the Creation till our Saviour's Crucifixion, which would have kept him in Employ, and exercised his Talent in Syllogizing, and he at last might have presented the World with a Folio of new-fashioned Logick.

He is all in Confusion and Wrong; he joyns that together which God has put asunder, making no Distinction betwixt the Law and the Gospel, but unites them.

John the Baptist's Ministration was wholly under the legal Dispensation, (though he was the Forerunner and Preparer of the Way of the *Messiah*) yet he lived and dyed a Subject of the Law of *Moses*, and Member of the

the *Jewish Church*: His Enemies, the *Pharisees*, could not detect him of the Breach of one Precept of the Law, though he was inspired with the Holy Ghost, not inferior to any of the Prophets, and sealed his Testimony with his Blood: *Moses* and the Prophets were eminently inspired also, and wrought many Miracles, which *John* did not.

The Law it self was dispensed by Inspiration; and again, the Abrogation and Abolition thereof was pronounced and published by Inspiration. The Apostles were inspired and wrought many Miracles before Christ's Passion, and yet so far from being profess'd Christians, that they did not believe that Christ should suffer for the Sins of the World, nor rise again from the Dead. And such devout Subjects were they of the *Mosaic Law*, and Members of the *Jewish Church*, that at the very Time of Christ's Ascension, they expected the same were to be continued, *Acts* i. 6.

'Tis plain therefore that all were not Christians who were inspired, but as they became by Faith and Obedience the Subjects of the Gospel Dispensation.

And when Conversion is spoke of as being the Effect of, or implying spiritual Baptism, it is improbable, if not impossible, that we should mean any other, than in an Evangelical or Gospel Acceptation.

And seeing there is no other Dispensation in Being, but the Evangelic, What absurdity is it in *O. E.* to urge upon us Instances out of an antiquated and abolish'd Dispensation; when he knows in his Heart, that the Question is only about those of that Dispensation, which now exists, and will till the End of Time? Can he produce any one Text that says or maintains that any were, or may be, truly converted Christians, or Subjects of the New Covenant, without the Baptism of the Spirit. I can readily produce him a Text which plainly maintains, That every true Christian Convert is baptized with the Spirit, *viz.* 1 Cor. xii. 13. *By one Spirit, we are all baptized into one Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, Bond or Free.*

Nor

Nor do we deny but that whoever were, in former Dispensations, truly converted or sanctified, it was through the Efficacy of the Spirit of God ; and to say the same were baptized, would be neither absurd nor erroneous. The Prophets in the Law commanded the *Jewish* Professors to wash and purify their Hearts ; O Jerusalem, *wash thine Heart from Wickedness, that thou may'st be saved*, Jer. iv. 14. *Wash ye, make ye clean*, Isaiah: i. 16. Inasmuch as this Washing was inward and spiritual, it may very properly be called spiritual Baptism, which is necessarily implied by Washing, tho' the Word *Baptize* or *Baptism* occurs not in the Old Testament, being not of an Hebrew, but a Greek Derivation. But that the Effusion, Gifts and Influences, of the Holy Spirit, bestowed on Believers in the Gospel, are much more abounding, than what were generally received in former Dispensations, is clear from these Texts.

He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his Belly shall flow Rivers of living Water : (but this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive ; for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified) *John vii. 38.*

But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my Name ; he shall teach you all Things, and bring all Things to your Remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you. *John xiv. 26.*

It is expedient for you that I go away ; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you ; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. *John xvi. 7.*

Receiving, saith the Apostle, the End of your Faith, even the Salvation of your Souls. Of which Salvation the Prophets have enquired, and searched diligently, who prophesied of the Grace that should come unto you. Searching what or what Manner of Time the Spirit of Christ, which was in them, did signifie ; when it testified before-hand the Sufferings of Christ, and the Glory that should follow.

'Tis

'Tis therefore the Change, or Conversion, wrought by this glorious Manifestation of the Spirit reveal'd after our blessed Redeemer's Sufferings, in Consequence of his most glorious Victory and Triumph over all the Powers of Darkness, Death and the Grave, leading Captivity captive, and obtaining Gifts for Men, that we call spiritual Baptism, or rather the Effect thereof; and the same is a Definition safe and orthodox, and will abide Examination without the least Imputation of Inconsistence.

But as for our Adversaries Definition hereof, it is attended with the greatest Inconsistence: Though they affirm that none were baptized with the Holy Ghost, before the Day of *Pentecost*; and that it ceased with the Lives of the Apostles; yet the Terms delivered in their Definition, fairly extend it to every Age, both past and to come, wherein any Miracles have, or shall be effected by the Spirit of God. Which is an apparent Contradiction.

Having sufficiently defended the first Proposition concerning what we mean by the Baptism of the Spirit, we shall proceed to examine what he says against the Second, viz. That Men have been, and may be the instrumental Means of administering this Baptism through the Co operation of Christ as the principal and efficient Cause.

Pag. 12. He would have us think that Dr. *Dell* agrees with him herein, saying, "That the Creature cannot baptize but with the Creature;" but this is nothing at all to O. E's. Purpose, since *Dell* here speaks of Man, as of himself, without the Concurrence of supernatural Assistance; for in either Places, in his said Discourse of Baptisms, he holds that Man did baptize with the Holy Ghost. So it is a false Representation, to draw such an unnatural Inference, either from *Dell* or R. *Barclay*, since he very well knows they are not speaking of *John* as an Apostle or Minister of Christ, included in the Commission, *Matt.* xxviii. 19. This Opponent's whole Aim being at Perturbation, he labours all he
O can

can to darken and perplex the Question, to divert and elude the Reader from a right Understanding of the Truth we contend for ; but how openly doth this expose the Meanness of his Disposition, and Weakness of his Cause.

Inasmuch as the Controversy is wholly in Relation to the Commission, *Matt.* xxviii. 19. the Objects thereof and Subjects of the Gospel Dispensation only, according to his own * Proposal, let him keep close to the Point without such impertinent Digressions ; we are not at all obliged to follow him in the frequent Excursions, Evasions and Retrogressions he makes when ever he finds himself in Difficulty. Since he cannot keep upon the Stage of his own chusing, but leaps off to escape the Stroke, his Antagonist is not obliged to follow him.

It cannot be denied, nay, it is allowed by All, that the abovesaid Commission was not given till after Christ's Resurrection ; nor put in Execution till the Day of *Pentecost*, which they were to wait for, to be fitly qualified and endued with Power, to act in Conformity thereto. So the very Circumstances and Nature of the Subject necessarily requires us, as often as we speak, either of the Ministers or Persons baptizing, or of the Hearers, or Persons baptized with the Holy Ghost, to have Relation to a Time posterior and subsequent to the Date of the Commission and Commencement of the Gospel Dispensation ; and to this we are resolved to adhere. Having thus briefly advertised the Reader of the unmanly and evasive Tricks of our Opponent and the true State of the Question ; we shall proceed in Examination.

Pag. 12. " The Creature cannot baptize but with
" the Creature ; and indeed the contrary Supposition must

* Pag. 11. Where he says, " The whole Controversy turns
" upon this Hinge, whether the Baptism commanded in *Matt.*
" xxviii. 19. be Water-baptism, or the Baptism of the Holy
" Ghost."

“ must have a most frightful Aspect to Humble-mind-
 “ ed and truly religious Men, who are tender of the
 “ Glory of God, because it makes Man greater than
 “ the Holy Ghost. What ! Man baptize with the Holy
 “ Ghost ? The eternal Spirit of God to be in the Gift
 “ of Man ! This cannot be ; because, from the eternal
 “ Law of Reason, and the everlasting Nature of Things,
 “ The Giver must be always greater than the Given.
 “ But Man is not greater than God. Consequently,
 “ not the Giver of the Holy Ghost : And indeed the
 “ very supposing of it, must, at least, border upon
 “ Blasphemy.

When he says, “ Man cannot baptize with, or give
 “ the Holy Ghost,” Man must be considered, either
 as in his natural State and Capacity, wherein he is
 wholly destitute of any Power to effect such a Work,
 or as in a spiritual Estate and Condition, wherein he be-
 ing influenced by the Power of the Almighty, and by
 that supernatural Co-operation may be instrumental in
 the Performance of it.

But there's no Probability that he intends the *First*,
 because we never pretended such a Thing : Nor do I
 believe he would venture to assert it. Our Words are
 so full and express to the Contrary, *viz.* That Man can
 do nothing of himself. He must then necessarily mean
 the *Last*, the which is not only opposite to many Texts
 of sacred Scripture, and the Sense of Commentators, and
 to O. E. himself too.

In pag. 19. He says, “ The Apostles were able to
 “ cast out Devils, and to heal all Manner of Diseases by
 “ a Touch of the Hand only.”

In his *second Stroke*, p. 57. he says, “ they had Power
 “ to cast out Devils, raise the Dead, heal all Manner
 “ of Diseases, &c.

Now, that casting out Devils, raising the Dead to
 life, healing the Sick, &c. necessarily implies a giving
 or dispensing what is superior to human Nature,
 greater than Man, or above his Power and Capacity

or natural Ability to perform, I conceive none will deny.

“ But this cannot be, says O. E. because from the
“ eternal Law of Reason, and the everlasting Nature of
“ Things, the Giver must always be greater than the
“ Given.”

2. He repeatedly affirms that Men did work Miracles.

But the Nature of a Miracle signifies the Performance of something that is above the natural Abilities or Capacity of the Agent to effect ; and the which necessarily implies a giving or dispensing what is greater than the Giver, at least, in the Sense O. E. insists upon. So he again flatly contradicts himself, in affirming that it is contrary to the eternal Law of Reason, &c.

3. He says, “ That *Philip* was full of the Holy Ghost, and preached the Gospel to the *Samaritans*, and converted them.”

And in his *second Stroak*, pag. 60. saith, “ I freely acknowledge the Work of Sanctification is carried on by the Spirit of God in the Soul of Man ; and that no Man is converted, or turn'd from Sin to God, without the internal Operations of it.”

If *Philip* converted them, which is his Term, not ours, nor the Scripture's, by preaching the Gospel, and if no Man is converted without the Internal of Operations of the Spirit, or Holy Ghost, both which O. E. affirms ; would it not then naturally follow, that *Philip* by Preaching dispensed of, or administred the Spirit.

This, I say, is an unavoidable Consequence, and what he can by no Means recede from or evade. In the one Place he positively asserts, That *Philip* converted them ; in the Other, That no Man can be converted, or turn'd to God, without the internal Operation of the Spirit of God, which is equivalent to say, that it is always the Holy Spirit, by its internal Operation, which converteth.

To

To reconcile these, O. E. must inevitably allow, that *Philip* was the instrumental Means of conferring and administering those Measures of the Spirit to those he is said to have converted, whereby they were converted.

Since he asserts, as above, that it is always the Spirit which converts, and also that *Philip* converted many, unless he would have us to believe that *Philip* and the Holy Spirit are synonymous or convertible Terms, he must of necessity allow that the *former* was a Means through God of dispensing or administering the *latter*, whereby he ascribes the Act to the Instrument.

Thus he has clearly and fully given up the Point, and fallen in with our Doctrine. He has quite demolished his Fabrick with his own Hands.

How could he have the Assurance so repeatedly to assert, that it is nothing short of Blasphemy to suppose that Men ever dispensed or administered the Spirit? And again, on the direct contrary frequently to affirm, that Men had Power to work such extraordinary Miracles as raising the Dead, casting out Devils, healing all manner of Distempers, &c. and to convert or turn many Souls from the Power of Satan unto God, none of which could possibly be effected without the Administration of the Spirit.

But more yet, in his *Third Stroak* pag. 17 he says,
 “ The Word it self, how faithfully soever preach’d, is
 “ not the Food of Souls, but it is one of *Sion’s* Breasts
 “ which contains sincere Milk, such as new born Babes
 “ in Christ, and indeed all the Disciples of Christ have
 “ a great Desire for: the Word it self is but a Bone,
 “ but the Presence of God, by his Spirit in the Word,
 “ is the Marrow which feeds the Soul.”

This is so exactly opposite in *Terminis* to his Hypothesis, that I shall collate them, and with no other Variation than what the Nature of the Question requires, *i. e.* when we say, *Men administer, or dispense of the converting and sanctifying Gifts of the Spirit*, we mean no other, as we have abundantly declar’d, than that *Men* are only the *instrumental Means*. So O. E.’s positive
 Negation

Negation must necessarily be always taken, or understood, in the same Sense and Limitation in which we affirm. This I would have the Reader never lose Sight of whilst he peruses the Controversy. The parallel Specimen then runs thus,

Oswald Edwards,

Preaching the Word faithfully contains the Presence of God by his Spirit, as the Breast doth Milk, and the Bone doth the marrow, and is the Vessel or Instrument which conveys it to the Souls of the Hearers.

Oswald Edwards,

It is contrary to the Everlasting Nature of things, and Blasphemy to suppose, that any Man through the Presence of God by his Spirit influencing him, should be any instrumental Means or Cause of administering or dispensing of the Holy Ghost.

What Positions can be more incompatible than these? But observe how egregiously he charges and contradicts the Apostle,

The Apostle Paul,

Rom. i. 11. *I long to see you, says Paul, that I may impart to you some spiritual Gift, or Gift of the Spirit.*

Gal. iii. 5. *He that ministrETH to you the Spirit.*

Oswald Edwards,

What! Man minister the Gift of the Spirit! it borders on Blasphemy to suppose it!

The Eternal Spirit of God to be administered by Man! This is contrary to the eternal Law of Reason. pag. 12.

By one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether Bond or Free. 1 Cor. xii. 13.

None were baptized with the Spirit, but they who were endued with its miraculous Gifts, as speaking with Tongues, &c. 2d Stroak, pag. 61.

But

But more yet, pag. 14. he strenuously denies that *Ananias* was any means of *Paul's* being filled with the Holy Ghost. But again in the same Page he says, that “ *Ananias* was sent to *Paul* to this Intent, that he might receive his Sight and be filled with the holy Ghost.”

To say, that *Ananias* was sent to *Paul* with an Intent that he might be filled with the Holy Ghost, very plainly ascribes to *Ananias* the Means of *Paul's* being filled with the Holy Ghost. *Ananias's* Commission to *Paul*, *Acts* ix. 17, 18. and the Account of what he acted in conformity thereto, as much ascribes the Reception of the Holy Ghost, as the Restoration of his Sight, to *Ananias*, as the instrumental Means, by equally enjoyning the Performance of both, and also declaring the Accomplishment thereof in consequence of his Administration. And there is no Objection to be made against the *last*, but what as much affects the *first*. Was it above the natural Capacity, and Abilities of Man, to confer the Holy Ghost? So was it likewise to restore the Blind to Sight? Was the *first* the peculiar Work of God, as the primary, immediate, and efficient Cause? So was also the *last*; and yet both ascribed to Man as the Instrument: The Angel in his Message to *Cornelius*, as related by *Peter* himself, *Acts* xi. 13, 14. very plainly attributes to the Apostle the Means whereby *Cornelius* and his Company receiv'd the holy Ghost, viz. *Send to Joppa, and call for Simon whose Surname is Peter, who shall tell thee Words whereby thou and all thy House shall be saved.* If they were to be saved by his Words, then consequently his Words must have been a Means of conveying what was saving.

We shall here examine another Specimen of *O. E's* Logick before we conclude the present Question.

Pag. 20. Prop. 1. “The *Quakers* are not endued with more Power from on high, than were the Apostles of Christ before the Day of *Pentecost*, no nor with so much.

Prop. 2. “The Apostles could not baptize with the holy Ghost before the Day of *Pentecost*, according to the *Quakers* own Doctrine.

From

From these two Propositions this Third arises,
 Prop. 3. "The *Quakers* cannot baptize with the
 " Spirit, neither are they baptized with it.
 Prop. 4. "The Baptism of the Spirit is essential to
 " Salvation : So the *Quakers* corruptly teach.
 From the 3d and 4th Proposition the 5th is deduced.
 Prop. 5. "The *Quakers* cannot be saved."

The Term *Power* in the first Proposition is ambiguous and equivocal, requiring a Definition, and his meaning thereby to be precisely fixt; but this is altogether wanting. *Sampson* was endued with an extraordinary Power when he kill'd a Lion, slew a thousand Men with the Jaw Bone of an Ass, carried away the Gates of the City, and remov'd the main Pillar of the House to the Destruction of his Enemies, &c.

When *O. E.* says that the Apostle before Christ's Passion had a greater Power than the *Quakers*, or any Ministers of the Gospel, he should have explain'd what he means thereby, whether a greater Power to work Miracles, or were more powerful Preachers of the Gospel; the Apostle mentions 1 Cor. xii. *Diversities of Gifts by the same Spirit.*

Therefore his Syllogism consists of four Terms, which renders it vicious in the Composure or Structure, and destroys its Validity.

Besides, the Instance is quite out of the Question too, what he predicates of the Subject Apostles, relates to a Time antecedent to the Date of the Commission, *Mat. xxviii.* So 'tis just such as the rest of his Logick, and amounts to nothing, unless to expose his own Folly and Ignorance; and to make the same more conspicuous to the Reader, we shall make the following Retortion,

Prop. 1. *O. E.* is not endued with more Power from on high than were the Apostles before the Day of *Pentecost*, nor with so much.

Prop. 2. The Apostles before our Lord's Crucifixion did not believe his Death, Resurrection and Ascension, nor the Abrogation of the *Levitical Law*, and Commencement of the Gospel Dispensation.

Prop.

Prop. 3. *O. E.* cannot believe in Christ's Death, Resurrection, Ascension, &c. nor knows what they are or Mean, any more than the Apostles did, in his Sense.

Prop. 4. A Belief in Christ's Death, Resurrection, Ascension, &c. is essential to Salvation. So *O. E.* teaches.

Prop. 5. *Oswald Edwards* cannot be saved.

To return his own Sentence again, p. 21. "Friend *Oswald*, thou art thine own Judge, for out of thine own Mouth this Sentence comes, as a genuine Retortion of what thy self hast laid down." What Judgment thou metest to others, must be measured to thee again.

And indeed those Propositions of *O. E.*'s. and these in this Retortion, being founded upon one and the same Parity of Reason, are equally either True or False; he cannot evite the Force of the *last*, without giving up the *first*, *Utrum bonum*, &c. Let him chuse whether he had rather have: These gross Absurdities; palpable Errors, heterodox Notions, Confusion and Self-contradictions, he has plunged himself into, are no small Derogation from the Honour of a good Cause, as well as from the Dignity of a Minister of the Gospel.

In his *second Stroke*, pag. 56. and also Prop. 4. pag. 18. He asserts, "That the *Quakers* do Err exceedingly, to suppose that the Performance of the Commission in *Matt. xxviii. 19.* was before the Apostles Ability, because they were commanded to tarry at *Jerusalem*, till endued with Power from on high. — It is most manifest, *says he*, they were able to do what Christ commanded them amongst their own Country Men of the same Language with themselves. But inasmuch as they were now to go to all the World, and teach Nations whose Language they were unacquainted with, &c."

By this it is very plain that he maintains That the Apostles, &c. received no other Qualification, or En-

dowment by that most eminent and extraordinary Effusion of the Holy Ghost, than merely the Knowledge and Use of unlearned Languages ; or a Supply of the Defect of human Literature.

But what has he offered to evince it ; not a Word. Nay, I should no less wonder if he should pretend Proof of what he here asserts, than I do at the Assertion itself, which in my Opinion, is as notoriously false as the Day is Light. It is plainly set forth in *Luke*, xxiv. 47, 48, 49. *Acts*, i. 4. to 8. that the Apostles, after Christ gave the Commission, wanted Power and Ability to put it in Execution, or to act in Pursuance thereto, even in *Jerusalem* and *Judea*. *Behold I send the Promise of my Father upon you, but tarry ye in the City of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with Power from on high. But ye shall receive Power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be Witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem and all Judea, Samaria, &c.* Observe, they were to wait for, and receive Power from above, before they could be Witnesses, or execute the Commission, even in *Jerusalem* and *Judea*.

And their Ignorance of Christ's spiritual Kingdom and Government, and Expectation of its being an earthly One, and Unbelief of the Abrogation of the legal Dispensation, very clearly evidence how unfit they were at that Time, and what Need they had of being endowed with Power from above, and of farther Illumination in Order to their being suitably qualified for the Promulgation of the Gospel ; to declare unto the World an universal and eternal Redeemer, and the great Advantage that accrew'd through the Sufferings, Death, Resurrection, Ascension, Glorification, and Intercession of our Saviour ; the Abolition of the first Covenant, and the Introduction and Commencement of the New ; and Sufficiency of Faith in Christ, without the Works of the Law. All which and more were implied in their Commission.

Pag. 16. O. E. having cited *Acts* xi. 17. he expounds it thus. " The Amount of these Words, says
" he

“ *he, is fairly this, Seeing God was pleased to give*
 “ *them his Spirit, as he gave it to us in the Beginning,*
 “ *and thereby baptized them with the Holy Ghost, as*
 “ *he had before baptized us, What was I that I should*
 “ *withstand God, in refusing to baptize them with Wa-*
 “ *ter.*”

It is undeniably evident, that these Words, *Foras-*
much as God gave them the like Gift, &c. What was I
that I should withstand God, have no Relation to Water-
 baptism at all, but to the Charge exhibited by those of
 the Circumcision, *Acts xi. 3.* which consists of two
 Parts, *first,* that he went in unto Men uncircumcised,
secondly, and did eat with them. The Apostle, to defend
 himself from the Imputation of Blame herein, related
 the Matter, expounding it unto them in Order from
 the Beginning. See *Acts xi.* from 1. to 18.

And as there is not the least Hint or Intimation of
 Water-baptism in their Accusation, it would be absurd
 to suppose that the Apostle had any Reference thereto,
 in his Defence especially, since there is not a Word
 throughout his Vindication, in Cap. xi. that he either
 baptized them, or commanded them to be baptized in
 Water.

Therefore *O. E.* doth greatly Err, in maintaining
 that the Apostle alledged their Reception of the Holy
 Ghost in Justification of, or as a Warrant for, his com-
 manding them to be so baptized. 'Tis such an egregi-
 ous Perversion of the Words of the inspired Apostle,
 that we must necessarily believe that the Evangelist
 would have us understand, That going in unto Men,
 and Eating with them, is the same Thing with Baptizing
 them in Water; or else that the Apostle acted so im-
 pertinent and absurdly, as to make his Vindication
 contrary, *et Sensu et Verbis,* to the very Nature of his
 Accusation, and to go about to defend himself from
 what he was not accused of, nor charged with.

This Account, *Acts xi.* makes rather against Water-
 baptism, than for it. The Text says, that *Peter re-*
 P 2 heard

heard the Matter from the Beginning, and expounded it in order.

As the Apostle, in his Rehearſal of the Matter by way of Defence, has not omitted any of thoſe peculiar Incitements that diſpoſed him to go to the Houſe of *Cornelius*, ſo we may very reaſonably conclude that he in the ſaid Rehearſal, or Relation of Fact, has not omitted what he performed when arriv'd there, in Obedience to Chriſt's Commiſſion, *Mat. xxviii. 19.* or any Part of his Duty as a Miniſter of the Goſpel.

But in aſmuch as *Peter*, in the ſaid Relation given to the Apoſtles, &c. took not any ſuch Notice of Water-baptiſm as that he had commanded it, though he rehearſed all that he had perform'd purſuant to his Commiſſion, but mentions their being baptized with the Holy Ghoſt under his Miniſtry, (which implies as much as if he had ſaid, *that he taught baptizing them*) 'tis a moſt ſtrong and cogent Argument that Water baptiſm is no Part of that Commiſſion, but that it is the Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt which is there intended.

Second Stroke p. 72, *O. E.* in order to prove that we utterly deny Chriſt's outward Maniſtation in the Body born of the Virgin, brings in *W. Penn* ſpeaking after this manner, * "Faith in Chriſt's outward Maniſtation a deadly Poiſon theſe latter Ages has been infected with, to the Deſtruction of godly Living.

But *W. Penn's* Words truly tranſcribed are, "The Diſtinction between Moral and Chriſtian, the making holy Life legal, and Faith in the Hiſtory of Chriſt's outward Maniſtation only, have been a deadly Poiſon theſe latter Ages have been, &c.

Where obſerve, that *O. E.* leaves out not only the former Part of the Sentence, (which concurs with the Subſequent in conſtituting, or in relation to the Epithet *deadly Poiſon*) but alſo fix or ſeven Words of the Lines which he has quoted, and he hath made it falſe ¶ *Engliſh*

* Quakeriſm a new Nick-name for old Chriſtianity.

¶ By changing *have* into *has*.

lish too, perhaps to render it more suitable to his own Performances.

The Abuse O. E. has committed in handling this Passage is so obvious, that 'tis admirable he had the Assurance to expose it to publick view. But what is most surprising is, that he should have the Face to affirm, as in pag. 73, that it was faithfully transcribed or collected! A most abominable Untruth! How unaccountable and strange it is, that a grave *Baptist*, who, out of Pretences of more primitive Simplicity and Spirituality in Worship, dissents from the National Church, should be guilty of vile Forgery and Perversion to render Persons *Heretical*, for that which in reality is as sound and orthodox as any thing can be spoken!

Who dares deny, that Faith in the History of Christ's outward Manifestation *only* is a deadly Poison? Is it not evidently such a Faith as this, *viz.* meerly historical, without the Production of good Works through inward Sanctity, accomplish'd by the Operation of the holy Spirit, which the Apostle compares to that of *Devils*, James ii. 19, 20. Is not this the Faith of those to whom Christ pronounced that dreadful Sentence, *Mat. vii. 23. Luke xiii. 27. Depart from me ye that work Iniquity, &c.* These Passages suppose the want of Obedience to the Dictates and Influences of the Spirit, or Christ's inward and spiritual Manifestation, which if obeyed, produces an operative or saving Faith, or what is accompanied with good Works.

But O. E.'s Forgery lies in representing us to deny Faith in Christ's outward Manifestation (which we plead for as necessary to all who have the Benefit of the holy Scripture) What can be more vilely traducing?

By what he has done to this Passage, we may judge of the rest he there mentions, as *ex Ungue Leonem*.

Ibid. pag. 52. To prove that two Baptisms, *viz.* Water and Spiritual Baptism are not contrary to *Epbes. iv. 5.* and that the one Baptism there mentioned must be Water-baptism, he says, "If the 4th Verse be join'd with the 5th, we shall find that Christ hath one Baptism"

“ism contradistinguish’d from the one Spirit—that
 “therefore the one Baptism, since distinct from the one
 “Spirit, must be Water-baptism.”

Ans. In this Text *Ephes. iv. 3, 4, 5.* the Apostle clearly distinguisheth between the efficient Cause and the Effects produced, and yet preserves the necessary and inseparable Relation which they bear to each other. But *O. E.* is so absurd as to attempt to destroy it.

If because the Apostle says *there is one Spirit and one Baptism*, that therefore it is not a spiritual Baptism; by the same Parity of Reason, the Unity there mention’d is not a spiritual Unity; the one Body is not a spiritual Body; the one Hope is not a spiritual Hope; nor the one Faith a spiritual Faith; since they are all as much distinguished there from the one Spirit, as the one Baptism is. But as the Unity, the one Hope, one Faith, and one Body are all spiritual, so is the one Baptism likewise; for as the Body is mystical and spiritual, so is it highly rational and necessary, that the Immersion or Baptism whereby its Purgation is effected be spiritual also, according to *1 Cor. xii. 12, 13.* *For as the Body is one, and hath many Members, and all the Members of that one Body being many, are one Body; so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.* And *Eph. i. 22, 23.* *The Church which is his Body, the Fulness of him who filleth all in all.*

Ibid. pag. 57. He asserts, “That if spiritual Baptism
 “doth imply Conversion, or turning People from
 “Darkness to Light, and from the Power of Satan to
 “God, it would never be in the Power of any Minister
 “to know whether ever he did or acted in Conformity
 “to the Commission, *Mat. xxviii. 19.* there are so
 “many *Demas’s* and *Simon Magus’s* in the Church.”

But in pag. 55, 56, he affirms, “That *Philip* converted the *Samaritans*, turning them from Darkness
 “to Light, and from the Power of the Devil to God,
 “and (thereby) acted in exact Conformity to the Commission, *Mat. xxviii.* What

What can be more flatly contradictory than these Assertions are to each other ?

1. To affirm that Christ's Ministers did act in exact Conformity to his Commission, in converting and turning Men from Darkness to Light, &c. and yet that the same could never be able to know whether ever they had done it or not.

2. That there are *Demas's* and *Simon Magus's*, &c. in the Churches ; and yet the Ministers can never tell who are or who are not such.

3. That *Philip*, in Obedience to Christ's Command, did turn People from Darkness to Light, &c. and yet that it is the greatest Absurdity imaginable to suppose that Christ gave any such Command ; are Propositions so directly repugnant to each other, that those of one Side of the Question cannot be established without the Destruction of those of the other.

Page 23. 4th Stroke, " Read, I pray thee, the 13th, " 14th, 16th, and 17th Chapters of the *Acts of the A-* " *postles*, and take a View of *Paul's* Preaching at *An-* " *tiocb*, at *Lystra*, at *Derbe*, at *Philippi*, at *Thessalonica*, " at *Berea*, at *Athens*, at *Iconium* and elsewhere, and " see in what manner the Word was rejected by those " unto whom it was faithfully preached. When thou " has considered this Matter as it ought to be conside- " red, thou must necessarily see Cause of Recantation, " and a publick Acknowledgment of thine, and thy " Friend's Error, in saying, That the Baptism of the " Spirit is effected by the Act of Teaching, seeing such " vast Numbers were taught, both by Christ and his " Apostles, who were never baptized with the Holy " Ghost."

To suppose that Teaching and Preaching of the Word to be the outward Means of spiritual Baptism, and to allow that the same was rejected and put far from them ; and yet at the same Time to expect the spiritual Baptism to be produced in them, as the proper Effect of the said Means, is certainly such a Piece of Absurdity as I think can hardly be parallel'd. Besides, it as much,

if

if not more, affects his own Doctrine ; for his holding the Commission to mean Water-baptism, makes the Office and Duty of baptizing with Water as universal as that of Teaching : So in pursuance of O. E's Doctrine, whoever the Apostles and Ministers taught or do teach, they are bound to baptize them, whether they receiv'd their Doctrine or not. This, I say, is the very Tendency of his Objection ; whether he will retain it or retract it, let him chuse.

J. G. in a *Postscript* propounded several Queries to O. E. which he evaded answering ; one whereof requested a Definition of *Baptism* ; whether he held it to be *sprinkling* of Bodies, or *dipping* of Bodies ? The very Tendency of his Discourses made the Solution of this so necessary, that I admire he was not ashamed to decline it.

The several Parties who plead for Water-baptism are so divided and subdivided amongst themselves concerning it, that unless O. E. who earnestly advises others to submit thereto, precisely fixes his Terms, expressly declaring what he holds to be such, how is it possible any should obey his Admonitions ? The *Episcopalians* hold that *Lay-baptism*, or what is perform'd by *Presbyterians*, *Independents*, and *Anabaptists*, which they call *Anti-Episcopal Dissenters*, is invalid. Part 2d Preface pag. 105 of *Lay-baptism*, " That for Persons to baptize " who were never Episcopally commission'd, is an U- " surpation of a monstrous Nature." And that Author, pag. 270, 271, calls Baptizers among *Dissenters*, *un-commissioned Usurpers* ; and accounts it more safe, and less sinful, to be un-baptized, than to submit to their Baptism. Page 258 he refers to the Bishop of Oxford's *Charge consider'd*, to prove that *Dissenters* and other unauthorized Baptisms are null and void by the Articles, Canons and Rubricks of the Church of England.

And how averse both the *Episcopalians* and *Presbyterians* are to the Doctrine and Practice of the *Baptists*, the following Quotations may evidence.

D. Ruffen, in his Book against the *Baptists*, (which came out under the Protection of two of the Clergy) Chap.

Chap. 3. says, " That they (by denying their Infants
 " Baptism) do as much as in them lies to separate them
 " from Christ, and as it were pluck them out of his
 " Arms; offering them greater Injury than to dash
 " them against the Stones: 'Tis to deny them Church
 " Communion, and so deprive People of all sound
 " Hopes of their Salvation; for without Church Com-
 " munion, where it can be had, *he says*, he knows no
 " Salvation.—That it is hard to say what Account
 " the *Antipedobaptists* can give to God at the last Tri-
 " bunal, for their execrable Injury to their own Chil-
 " dren."

Cragge, in his Reply to *J. Tombs*, pag. 292, says,
 " I truly said *Anabaptism* with its Attendants was a dan-
 " gerous Error, that robs the Scripture of its Truth,
 " Infants of their Right, Parents of their Comforts,
 " the Church of its Members, Christ of his Merits,
 " God of his Glory; whereof every Word is true."

J. Calvin's Inst. lib. 3. cap. 3. §. 2. lib. 4. cap. 12.
 §. 12. *Ibid.* cap. 1. §. 13. is very severe against the *Bap-*
tists. *Ibid.* lib. 4. cap. 16. §. 31. he replies to twenty
 Arguments of *Servetus* the *Anabaptist*, and concludes the
 Section thus, "'Tis no marvel that these reprobate
 " Spirits, as if vext with Phrensy, do intrude all the
 " greatest Absurdities for Defence of their Error; be-
 " cause God doth with such Greediness justly take Ven-
 " geance of their Pride and Stubbornness.

" I hope I have, *saith he*, plainly demonstrated how
 " very feebly *Servetus* has defended the Cause of his silly
 " Brethren the *Anabaptists*."

In his last Section hereof he represents the Opposition
 of the *Baptists* against Infant-baptism, to be the " pe-
 " culiar Act of the Devil, to deprive us of the singular
 " Fruit of Affiance and spiritual Joy; and to diminish
 " the Glory of the Goodness of God."

Thus *Calvin*, whom *O. E.* in his *Second Stroak*, pag.
 28. affirms to have had no small Measure of the Spirit
 of God.

Again on the other Hand, no less opposite are the *Baptists* to the Practice of the *Episcopalians*, *Presbyterians*, &c. respecting Baptism; *J. Tombs*, in his *Plea*, &c. Part 1. Sect. 1. calls Infant-sprinkling a *prophane Abuse*, and *sinful Practice*. *Ibid.* Sect. 6, that it is a *Nullity*, &c.

Davye, in his Book, pag. 139, says, " 'Tis certain
" they (the *Pedobaptists*) have banished true Baptism out
" of their Churches." *Ibid.* pag. 47, " That the Bap-
" tism of Infants, so call'd, perform'd by Sprinkling,
" is indeed no Baptism."

By these few Hints given, it appears what Contention and Variance there is amongst the strenuous Asserters of Water-baptism about it; what one Party holds to be Christian Baptism, another affirms to be not only utterly null and void, but sinful, heretical, &c.

Were any of us to become Converts, and fall in with the *Baptists* Doctrine herein; 'tis easie to conceive how monstrous we should appear in the Eyes of the *Episcopalians*, *Presbyterians*, &c.

Were we to join with the *Presbyterians*, our Baptism would be accounted schismatical, heretical, and utterly null, by the *Episcopalians* and *Baptists*.

If we embrace the Perswasion of the *Episcopalians*, we should still be esteemed in the Judgment of the *Baptists* as unbaptized, if not worse.

How very reasonable then was it for him to have first ascertained what Baptism is, before he had urged a Compliance with his Doctrine?

But inasmuch as he has not defined and adjusted his Terms, or told what he precisely holds to be Baptism, and who has the Right to administer it, his Arguing is upon a meer *Individuum Vagum*, and concludes nothing in reference to Action.

Secondly, That his Pretence (as exhibited in his *first* and *second Stroaks*) of attacking the *Quakers*, in Defence of a common Cause, on behalf of the divers Denominations abovesaid, is most absurd and irrational.

Page 29, He questions "Whether those Authorities
 " produc'd, who maintain that the Baptism of the Spi-
 " rit means Conversion and Sanctification, did intend it
 " in the strict Scriptural Sense thereof?" In what
 other Sense would he have us think they hold it? Were
 they not then expounding the Scripture, and explaining
 what the Baptism of the Spirit is, or implies, according
 to the Scope and Sense of Scripture?

The Authors cited, who hold this Doctrine, are these,
viz. *Augustine*, who lived *Anno* 396, and *Chrysostom* his
 Contemporary, *Calvin*, *Piscator*, *Pareus*, *Erasmus*,
Cornelius a Lapide, *Grotius*, *Stephens* of *Paris*, *Dr.*
Willet, *Peters*, *Dr. Fulk*, *Burkit*, *Walter Brute*, *Bishop*
Taylor, the *Common Prayer-book*, the *Assembly of Divines*,
Poole, *Henry*, * *Stennet*, and *Daniel King*; these two
 are of his Brethren the *Baptists*; to which I shall add
 two more, as a Quaternion of Evidences of his own
 Fraternity against him, besides the rest.

John Hammett, in his Pamphlet of Baptism, pag. 20,
 21, says, "Secondly, If he should tell us that the Bap-
 " tism of the Holy Ghost does not put away the filthy
 " Inclinations of our fleshly Minds, the Apostles Words
 " would naturally tend to abate our coveting it; and
 " also be contradictory to all the other Descriptions of
 " its divine and purifying Operations."

Joseph Jenks, another eminent *Baptist*, in his *Defence*
 of *Hammett*, page 31, says, "And I still grant as I
 " have done before, that the Apostles, by their orderly
 " proceeding in Prayer and laying on of Hands, were
 " Instruments of Believers receiving such spiritual Gifts
 " as God was graciously pleased to bestow on them.

That of *Hammett's* is direct to the Point respecting
 the first Proposition, *viz.* "That the Baptism of the
 " Holy Ghost washes and sanctifies the Heart." And
Jenks's is as direct and pertinent touching the Second, *viz.*

Q 2

"That

* His Answer to *Russen*, pag. 73. on *John* iii. 5. and *Mat.* iii.
 11. says, "These Terms of *Fire* and *Water*, being frequently
 " used in the Holy Scriptures to signify the sanctifying Operation
 " of the Holy Spirit."

" That Men were the instrumental Means of conferring the Gifts of the Spirit." And to the same Import I have given several Authorities in Pages 75 and 76 of my *former*.

The real Truth of the Matter then is evidently this, *viz.* That O. E. is as opposite to all other Societies as he is to the People call'd *Quakers*; whether the Church of *Rome*, the Church of *England*, of *Geneva*, and his own the *Baptists*; and thereby proclaims himself to be neither *Romanist*, *Episcopalian*, *Presbyterian*, nor *Baptist*.

But what is most remarkable, he cannot agree with himself, his Discourses so much abound with Self-contradiction and Inconsistency, that one Part thereof mutually destroys the other, and makes the Contest little else but *Oswald Edwards* against *Oswald Edwards*; the Instances we have given do sufficiently evince the Truth hereof, though but the least Part of what might be collected. Nor had I followed him half so far in his Meanders and heterodox Notions, how wild and extravagant soever, had not his appearing so exceedingly intoxicated with an Imagination of the Unanswerableness of his Performance, repeatedly comparing his Logick to * *Mathematical Certainty*, the *bright shining of the Sun out of a Cloud*, &c. and his acting as the *Baptists* Champion too, made it necessary, in order that both he and they might see his gross Mistakes, and avoid them for the future.

To conclude, First, Since Water-baptism is a meer Ceremony or external Rite, and not an Action of any moral Nature or Eternal Rectitude, as having any Efficacy to cleanse and purifie the Soul; it cannot be a Matter of perpetual Obligation upon Christians without a positive Law, or Institution, expressly declaring the Manner *how*, the Time *when*, the Place *where*, the Persons *to whom*, and the Persons *by whom* it is to be administered:

* I can't think that a Person, worthy of the Name of a Mathematician, would have been so Antimathematical in his Reasoning, or betray'd half so much Weakness and Error in his Productions.

ministred : For, unless these Particulars, which are so many constituent Parts of the whole, were fully and clearly determined, it is impossible that any Age should be free from perpetual Debates, Confusion and Variance, concerning it ; the Truth whereof, in Matter of Fact, is too apparent to be denied.

2. But there is not any such Institution to be met with, delivered either by Christ, or his Apostles. Therefore it is not of perpetual Obligation upon Christians.

3. Nor can any of our Adversaries produce Example for their Practice. No, not O. E. himself ; for he is intirely at an Uncertainty about several of the above-said Particulars, &c. is plainly opposite in what they call an Essential Part, viz, the Form. Let him shew us the Text where it appears that any of the Apostles said, *I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. Not one I am very sure can be found.

So thou may'st easily see, *Reader*, who ever thou art, that this Antagonist has not, nor cannot produce any just Motives of Credibility to procure an Assent to what he so importunately urges and exhorts to. Would he have us so very credulous and susceptible of Imposition, as to be disposed to a Compliance by the Influence of an implicit Faith, or upon the Authority of his *ipse dixit* ?

4. With respect to the Commission, *Matt. xxviii. 19.* which enjoyn'd the Apostles, &c. to teach Baptizing ; It is so far from relating to Water-baptism, that the Word, *Water*, is not once named therein ; nor doth it at all determine, nor so much as mention any of the above-said Particulars, necessary to the Constitution of the Action, or Performance of the Ceremony. The Baptism here intended must be allowed to be Christ's Baptism ; but to hold that that is with Water, is contrary to *Matt. iii. 11. Mark i. 8. Luke iii. 16. John i. 33.*

The

The Apostle *Paul*, when speaking of Water-baptism, declares, *That Christ sent him not to baptize*. And if he had no Commission for Water-baptism, we are sure none else hath.

5. As it is not the Body, but the Soul or Spirit, which is to be washed and sanctified, so the Lotion, or Baptism, must be spiritual which effects it.

6. It must be such a Baptism as saves; but the Apostle tells us first negatively, that it is not Water; then affirmatively, that it is that whereby a good Conscience doth ask, or inquire, after God, which Dr. *Birkitt* expounds to be the singular Effect of inward Baptism.

It must be the One Baptism, named *Eph. iv. 5.* and which, according to *1 Cor. xii. 13.* is that of the One Spirit. And

8. Since *O. E.* himself has proposed the whole Controversy to turn upon this Hinge, Whether the Baptism intended in *Mat. xxviii. 19.* be Water-baptism, or the Baptism of the Holy Ghost; and that the Decision and Determination of this Question lies in the Probation of these two Points, *viz.*

First, That Conversion, or Regeneration, is, or implies, the Baptism of the Spirit.

Second, That Men through the divine Influence and Assistance of the Spirit, as qualified Ministers of the Gospel, have and do convert, or turn Men from the Power of Satan unto God; and are thereby instrumental in Administring this Baptism.

The *First* we have not only clearly proved by Scripture Evidence. *Secondly*, by the Reason and Nature of Things, with the Etymology of the Word *Baptize*. *Thirdly*, by the concurring Testimonies of the approv'd Writers and Commentators of the several Denominations, his Brethren, the *Baptists*, included. But *fourthly*, by the fair and genuine Consequences of *J. B.* and *O. E.*'s own concessory Assertions.

The *Second* we have not only prov'd by Scripture and Reason; but *O. E.* agrees herewith, and vigorously

ously pleads on our Side of the Question ; maintaining and proving that Men did convert, giving many Instances of Matter of Fact.

So having sufficiently disprov'd and refuted what both my Antagonists, *J. B.* and *O. E.* have advanced on the Affirmative, in Favour of Water-baptism ; and effectually proved the Continuance and Necessity of Spiritual Baptism, and intirely removed all their Objections and Allegations in the Negative thereof ; the Controversy is now brought to this Issue, *viz.* that the Baptism intended in *Matt. xxviii. 19.* is the Baptism of the Holy Ghost.

And as the Result, or Conclusion, is produced by a Prosecution of the Question settled upon a Foundation of *O. E.*'s own chusing, and naturally flows from Premises by himself acceded to and maintained ; he is under the greater Obligation readily to acquiesce and submit thereto,

P O S T S C R I P T.

AS *J. B.* in his last Page, modestly desires us to forbear to use the reproachtul Name of *Anabaptists*, which, he says, hath often drop'd from Mr. *Foster's* Pen, I have therefore forbore it in these Treatises. And his Brother *O. E.* pag. 7. says, " my calling them *Anabaptists*, was to prepossess my Readers with an ill Opinion of them ; " and bestows two or three Pages in Railing at Me for it, to which I answer as follows,

That it was not by way of Reflection nor any Disrespect that I used the Word *Anabaptists*, but for the same Reason that they denominate us *Quakers*. Nor do I conceive that they have any better Authority for using the One to us, than we have for the Other to them.

them. If there is any Advantage, 'tis on our Side, that O. E. holds Sprinkling to be Baptism is plain (tho' he in other Places contradicts himself in denying it) for in his *second Stroak*, pag. 86. he says, "As for Dipping or Sprinkling, which relates to the Manner of Administ'ring that Ordinance, this is that in which the *Quakers* are not concern'd, in Regard they deny Water-baptism any Way administred."

Observe, he allows it to be Baptism, and an Ordinance of Christ, whether administred by Sprinkling or Dipping. Therefore since in O. E.'s Opinion, those who are sprinkled are baptized; and if he and his Brethren refuse to admit any of them as Members of their Society without baptizing them after their Manner, as they generally, if not always, do; they thereby perform Rebaptization, and are actually *Anabaptists*.

In the same Sense that the Practice of all other Denominations, whether the Church of *Rome*, the Church of *England*, the *Presbyterians*, and *Independents*, is said to be Baptism, O. E.'s, and his Brethren's, is *Anabaptism*.

If those several Denominations do allow of Baptism, and are baptized, as O. E. grants, then he himself is an *Anabaptist*. But the *first* is true, so likewise the *last*. Therefore unless O. E. doth publickly maintain, that all those Churches, who practice Sprinkling, are as destitute of Baptism as the People called *Quakers*: He must submit to the Title *Anabaptist*.

Ibid. "They must know that our Lord Jesus, together with his Apostles, were *Baptists*: They were not called *Quakers*, no more than *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, but we are sure they were *Baptists*."

If our Lord was a *Baptist*, as Administrator, it must be on the Account of Spiritual Baptism, not that of Water, since it is so evident that he administred the former, but never the latter. *Matt. iii. 11. John iv. 2.* Let him shew us the Text where the Apostles were called *Baptists*, in Respect of Water-baptism. If he says,

says, because they were probably baptized by *John*; by the same Argumentation we may call them *Jews*, because they were circumcised.

O. E. in his *fourth Stroak*, pag. 7. says, " Tell me
" why it is that when thou lettest the World know
" what the Opinion of *Oswald Edwards* is upon 1 Cor.
" 17. and *Eph. iv. 4, 5.* that thou dost not take any
" Notice of those Reasons, by which he has supported
" his Opinion; but passes them over with a total Si-
" lence, even as thou dost the whole of his Reasonings
" upon other Texts of Scripture, which thou and thy
" Friends have wrested."

His Opinion upon 1 Cor. i. 17. directly contradicts the very Words of the Text. The Apostle says, *Christ sent me not to baptize*, but O. E's Opinion is, that Christ did send him to baptize. And the Reasons he gives are 1st. That *Paul* thanked God that he baptized so few of them, and that for fear any should say, he baptized in his own Name. See mine p. 61 in the Margin. 2^{dly}. That the Word *not*, is not a Term of Exclusion; but should have the Words, *chiefly* or *principally* added thereto. See mine p. 61, 62, 63, in the Margin. Both which Reasons I have here inserted, examin'd and shew'd their Insufficiency and Absurdity too, as the Reader may find. And the same will appear touching what he calls his Reasonings upon other Texts which he says we have *wrested.

His *first* Argument, viz. That the legal Dispensation was abolished, and the Gospel commanded at Christ's Conception; and what he says on *Heb. ix. 17.* pag. 47. is answered, and flatly contradicted, by Dr. *Hammond*, the Archbishop *W. Dr. Prideaux*, and particularly by his Brethren the *Baptists*; and the Testi-
mony

* Tho' O. E. has filled up five Pages on this Text, viz. 1 Cor. i. 17. yet all he has said amounts to no more than the two Reasons aforesaid; all the rest is a Ramble of impertinent, circumlocutory, inconsistent jargon, vastly below Notice, And so is the major Part of his Productions, which will sufficiently perpetuate the Author's Folly to Posterity.

Testimony of *Origen*. See mine pag. 70, 71. in the Margin.

His *second*, founded on *John* iii. 26. iv. 2. from p. 47 to 54. is answered in mine p. 9, 10, 11.

What he offered in Defence of his *third* Argument from 53d. to 61st. is answered in mine, from pag. 23; to 41. and from 3 to 90. And what he says about the Apostles omitting the Terms of the Commission, viz. in the Name of the Father, &c. from pag. 61 to 63. is answered in mine, from pag. 60 to 68.

His *fourth* Argument, from the Beginning of pag. 63, to 70. relating to the Apostle's Use of Water-baptism, is answered in mine, from pag. 45 to 68.

What he asserts, pag. 70. and that Water-baptism was the Apostle's constant Practice to the End of their Lives, is answered in mine, from pag. 41 to 44, and in pages 163. 4, 5, 6. His Query proposed, p. 58, is answered from p. 165 to 169.

What he has said of *John* iii. 30. p. 73, 74. is answered from p. 68 to 73.

His reasoning on *Eph.* iv. 5. pag. 73 and 76, is refuted in mine, from pag. 115 to 126. — on *Pei.* iii. 21. in pag. 80 to 84. is answered, from pag. 95 to 106.

So that whatsoever has any thing of Argument, in his whole Performance, I have answered, though his Name is seldom mentioned: yet his Doctrine is very obviously and fully implied and * refuted. With what Face then could

* But how has *O. E.* defended himself and maintained his Doctrine in Opposition to those several Passages, wherein he is so fully answered and refuted? Has he not evidently dropt the whole, passing them over in total Silence, save giving my Opinion of one or two Particulars, but wholly concealed the Reasons I advanced to support the same. The Censure therefore which he indirectly passed on his Antagonist, naturally recoils upon himself, viz. "If thou didst not believe those Reasonings to be good, thou oughtst to have shewn the Insufficiency of them, and in that thou didst

could this Traducer affirm, that I took no Notice of his Reasonings, but pass them over in total Silence? Where's his Veracity? He an Author! He a Minister! Nay, rather a vain, empty Imitator and bold Intruder into the Office of an Evangelist! and too much like *Simon the Magician*; to whom he very unjustly † compares the People called *Quakers*, who whether in Reality, he was not rather a *Baptist* than a *Quaker*, and may bear a near Resemblance to *O. E.* himself or not, let the Reader judge. Was *Simon* rather a nominal than a real Believer? I am jealous that *O. E.* is such an One. Was *Simon* baptized with Water? So was *O. E.* Had

Simon

“ didst not do it, thou hast made thy self guilty of a Crime which
 “ can't easily be pardon'd by the Person thereby injured. What,
 “ mention a Man's Opinion to his Disadvantage, without regard-
 “ ing the Reasons by which he maintains it! This I don't take to
 “ be fair Dealing.” *Fourth Stroak*, page 7.

Nor has *O. E.* come off much better with *J. Gill*, how shamefully he evades *J. G.*'s Reasonings, pag. 35, 36, 37, against his first Argument: Nor is he any better in defending his second and third: What Notice has he taken of the fifteen Reasons advanced by *J. G.* pag. 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, further than Childishly telling the Reader, that “ they are certainly *Quakers* Reasons.” And very feebly he vindicates his fourth and fifth. He very well knows that *J. G.* has fairly enervated his sixth Argument, pag. 63, 64. His seventh, pag. 65, 66. His eighth, pag. 67, 68, 69. His ninth, pag. 69, 70. His tenth, pag. 70, 71, 72, 73, 74. His eleventh *J. G.* has refuted, pag. 74, 75. And concludes page 76 with a strong Retortion. His twelfth, pag. 76. His thirteenth, pag. 77, 78. His fourteenth, pag. 78, 79, 80, 81. All which Pages in *J. G.*'s Answer *O. E.* has pass over without any Examination, save a faint Essay to defend his fourteenth, which is answered in mine in the Pages above refer'd to. If the Reader pleases to inspect *O. E.*'s 65th page, he may observe what a poor Excuse he makes for leaving those eight Arguments undefended, viz. his 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th. And like one whose Strength is quite exhausted, lets them all drop and fall Victims to the Force of his Adversary's Pen. So that upon the whole, he quits the Stage with no small Disadvantage, and is so far from having any just reason to triumph, that he ought and must sit down with Shame and Confusion of Face.

† “ That old *Quaker*, says he, we read of in *Acts* viii. *Simon* the Conjuror—who bewitched the *Samaritans*.” 2d Stroak, p. 58.

Simon very gross and carnal Conceptions concerning the Gift of the Holy Ghost. Doth not *O. E.* entertain very erroneous Notions, touching the Baptism of the Holy Spirit? Was *Simon* in the Gall of Bitterness? Even so was (and I am afraid still is) *O. E.*

And to give the Reader a more recent and glaring Instance hereof than what he has in the foregoing met with; observe the following Catalogue of this Hibernian's Theological Phrasiology, viz. "*(a)* The *Quakers* are influenced by that lying Spirit that was in the Mouth of the false Prophets, the croaking Frog, the lying Light within. *(b)* I must affirm that the Spirit by which the *Quakers* are influenced is the Devil. *(c)* The poor deluded *Quakers*. *(d)* They are influenced by a lying Spirit. *(e)* That counterfeit Christ, the Light within, *alias* the Frog. *(f)* Because the *Quakers* oppose Water-baptism, they are influenced by the Spirit of the Devil, one of the unclean Frogs. *(g)* Be it known unto all Mankind, That they may with much more Safety catch a Lyon by the Tail, than meddle with the Nose of the Frog. *(h)* The *Quakers* are under the Power of a strong Delusion, and are quieted by the Devil in the Shape of a Frog. *(i)* The Light within, the Willy with the Wisp, the Jack in the Lanthorn, the unclean Spirit, the Frog. *(k)* The *Quakers* are governed by the unclean Spirit; they come with open Ears to the Croakings of a deluding Frog. *(l)* They are influenced by a Spirit of Delusion, in the Shape of a Frog."

Reader, is not this strange Sort of Argumentation? What do his Brethren think of this Divinity of their Minister and Champion? They seem to approve of his Pamphlets: A certain Preacher of their's furnished me with his *Second*, and another presented me with his

Fourth

(a) pag. 52. (b) 63. (c) 59. (d) 64. (e) 72. (f) 84. (g) 8. (h) 88, (i) 89. (k) 90. (l) 91.

Fourth. As far as they consent to approve of his Performance, so far are they chargeable with his indecent Language and Errors.

Certainly such abusive Scurrility and Ribaldry, must be nauseous to modest Ears: Nor will a good Cause ever want such. 'Tis my Opinion that he will incur with rational Men no small Degree of Contempt, with respect both to himself and his Cause, by his Scribbling.

His many Years Profession of, and all his Bustle and Noise he makes about, corporeal Washing, has proved very insignificant, to himself, in Relation to the one Thing needful. Whilst he dipps Others in Water, himself wants Spiritual Baptism, to cleanse his Inside, and wash away the Impurities of his Heart and Tongue. Wherefore I advise him to talk no more so vainly and foolishly against what he must at last either stand or fall by.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

PAGE 23. l. 15. for *Woman*, r. *Women*. p. 97.
 l. 32. for *either Places*, r. *other Places*. p. 121.
 l. 23. for *here*, r. *there*. Ibid. l. 29. for *commanded*, r. *commenced*. p. 122. l. 7. for *page 3*. r. 73. p. 124. l. 24. for *quieted*. r. *guided*.

(251)
BOOKS Printed and Sold by T. Sowle, Raylton
and Luke Hinde, at the Bible in George-Yard,
Lombard-Street.

A Collection of the Works of the memorable *William Penn*, late Governor of *Pennsylvania*. In two Volumes Folio. To which is prefixed, a Journal of his Life, with many original Letters and Papers, not before publish'd, Price 3os. 24 MA 59

The History of the Rise, Increase, and Progress, of the Christian People, called *Quakers*, intermixed with several remarkable Occurrences. Written in *Low Dutch*, by *William Sewel*, and by himself translated into *English*. The second Edition in *English*, revised and published with some Amendments. Price 14s.

The Christian Progress of that ancient Servant and Minister of Jesus Christ, *George Whitehead*, historically relating his Experience, Ministry, Sufferings; Trials and Service, in Defence of the Truth, and God's persecuted People, commonly called *Quakers*. In 4 Parts, Price 5s. 6d.

The Life and posthumous Works of *Richard Claridge*, being Memoirs and Manuscripts, relating to his Experiences and Progress in Religion: His Changes in Opinion, and Reasons for them; with Essays in Defence of several Principles and Practices of the People called *Quakers*. Collected by *Joseph Besse*. Price 5s.

A Defence of *Quakerism*, or, an Answer to a Book intituled, A Preservative against *Quakerism*; written by *Patrick Smith*, *M. A.* and *Vicar*, as he styles himself, of *Great Paxton*, in *Huntingtonshire*. With an Appendix, containing an Examination of the first Clais of *Quaker* Testimonies, produced in a late Vindication of the Bishop of *Lichfield* and *Coventry*. By *Joseph Besse*. Price 4s.

An Essay concerning the Restoration of Primitive Christianity, in a Conduct truly pious and religious. the 2d Edition, by *T. Bevan*, p. 1s.